

THE
**SOCIALIST
STANDARD**

1905

Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 5, Vol. I.]

LONDON, JANUARY, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

TO THE SOCIALIST WORKING-CLASS.

COMRADES,

The Socialist Party of Great Britain has received a communication from the Secretary of the British Section at the Amsterdam Congress, asking, among other things, whether the Party favoured the holding of a Conference with a view to forming in England a National Committee to deal with matters arising out of the International Congress. We have declined to take part in any such Conference on the grounds that it should be the task of the Socialist Party alone to deal with these questions, and that judging by the composition of the British Section at the Amsterdam Congress, at which the Party was represented, the proposed Committee would consist of men who are in no sense of the word Socialist. Elsewhere in this number we publish the correspondence at length, and take the opportunity of addressing the Socialist working-class concerning the grave issues therein raised.

To those who have followed intelligently the deliberations of past International Congresses, it is apparent that these Assemblies have been characterised by a lack of definiteness in their organisation, with the result that considerable confusion still exists as to the real nature of the decisions arrived at.

It is of course true that certain dangers and difficulties are inseparable from International Congresses, but we contend that these regrettable results are in a great measure due to the participation in them of organisations and men possessing neither the knowledge nor the right to voice the cause of the working-class.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is strengthened in this opinion by facts well known here which show clearly the principles animating many who took part in the recent Congress at Amsterdam. Our delegates thereto found such organisations as the Independent Labour Party, the Labour Representation Committee, the Social-Democratic Federation, and the Fabian Society claiming and obtaining admission as Socialist organisations. Thus were seen the defenders of Capitalism, the upholders of Child-slavery, the friends of Compromise and Reform, and the catspaw of the Bourgeois reaction generally, masquerading as Revolutionists, prostituting the name and spirit of Socialism, and confusing the workers on questions of vital importance.

The I.L.P. and S.D.F. both support representatives of the Capitalist Class in the political field; The I.L.P. in its official organ definitely repudiates the class-war, while it is admitted in "Justice" by the S.D.F. that there are occasions when the existence of the struggle may be forgotten with advantage by the workers for the emancipation of their class. The Fabian Society is not a working-class organisation and stands for State Capitalism. The L.R.C. is but the left wing of the Liberal Party and declines to recognise any Socialist Candidate.

The S.P.G.B. declines, therefore, to betray the working-class or to stultify itself by taking part in the proposed Conference when to do so would be to admit the right of those organisations to deal with the findings of the Congress of the International Socialist working-class.

With the object of placing future International Congresses on a definite Socialist basis, and securing proper and proportionate representation of all bona fide Socialist Parties thereto, the S.P.G.B. is preparing a memorandum for the consideration of the International Bureau and the Socialist Parties affiliated in the hope that measures will be adopted to as far as possible prevent the recurrence of past confusions and place the working-class of the world on a united and revolutionary platform.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.
London, January, 1905.

À LA CLASSE OUVRIÈRE SOCIALISTE.

CAMARADES,

À propos de la formation en Angleterre d'un Comité National pour traiter des affaires du Congrès International, The Socialist Party of Great Britain vient de recevoir un communiqué du secrétaire de la délégation anglaise au Congrès d'Amsterdam en invitant le Parti à lui faire savoir s'il nous était convenable d'assister à une conférence pour discuter ce projet. Nous avons refusé de prendre aucun part à cette entreprise croyant que le Parti Socialiste seul doit traiter de ces questions, et en considérant la constitution de la section anglaise au Congrès tenu à Amsterdam, où le Parti était représenté, un tel comité ne saurait pas être en nulle façon socialiste. Dans un autre part de ce numéro se trouve la correspondance en son entier, et nous profitons de l'occasion pour adresser la parole à la classe ouvrière Socialiste touchant les questions graves dont elle s'agit.

À ceux qui ont suivi d'une manière intelligente les délibérations des Congrès Internationaux antérieurs, il est clair que ces réunions sont dans le besoin d'un caractère déterminé vu qu'il y a encore beaucoup de confusion dans l'interprétation des résolutions prises.

Franchement nous admettons que le Congrès International court de grands dangers et difficultés, par suite d'une organisation telle qu'elle est, mais nous sommes d'avis que ces malheureux résultats sont inévitables puisqu'il y a des organisations et individus qui participent aux délibérations du Congrès sans avoir ni les connaissances ni le droit de prendre la parole dans le parlement de la classe ouvrière.

Des faits bien connus ici affermissent le S.P.G.B. dans cette opinion et démontrent clairement les sentiments qu'animent quelques-uns des délégués qui ont pris part au Congrès d'Amsterdam. Nos délégués y ont trouvé des organisations telles que The Independent Labour Party, The Labour Representation Committee, The Social Democratic Federation, et The Fabian Society, réclamant le droit de séance dans cette assemblée et parvenant à se faire accorder ce droit comme des organisations socialistes. Ainsi se virent les défenseurs du Capitalisme, de l'exploitation des enfants; les amis du compromis et de la réforme; et les marionnettes de la réaction bourgeoise se déguisant en Révolutionnaires pour confondre les ouvriers et prostituer le nom et même l'esprit du Socialisme.

The Independent Labour Party et The Social Democratic Federation, tous les deux soutiennent des représentants de la classe capitaliste dans le champ de politique; le I.L.P. rejette définitivement la lutte des classes dans son organe officiel, tandis que le S.D.F. admettent dans "Justice" qu'il y ait des circonstances où la classe ouvrière militante pourrait avantageusement mettre de côté la doctrine de la lutte des classes. The Fabian Society n'est pas une organisation de la classe ouvrière et tient pour le Capitalisme de l'État. The Labour Representation Committee n'est que l'extrême gauche du Parti Libéral et refuse d'appuyer aucun candidat socialiste.

Le S.P.G.B. refuse donc de trahir les intérêts de la classe ouvrière ou de se rendre ridicule en prenant part à la conférence proposée vu que d'y assister serait d'admettre le droit de ces organisations d'occuper au nom du Socialisme des résolutions du Congrès de la classe ouvrière internationale.

Dans le but d'établir les Congrès Internationaux prochains sur les bases solides du Socialisme et d'assurer la représentation équitable de tous les Partis Socialistes de bonne foi, le S.P.G.B. s'occupe de préparer une note pour la considération du Bureau International et tous les Partis Socialistes dans l'espoir que l'on prendra des mesures pour éviter en quelque sorte le retour de la confusion d'autrefois et réaliser l'unification de la classe ouvrière du monde fondée sur les véritables principes du Socialisme.

LE COMITÉ EXÉCUTIF
du THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.
London, Janvier, 1905.

AN DIE SOZIALISTISCHE ARBEITER-SCHAFT.

GENOSSEN!

Der Socialistischen Partei von Grossbritannien ist vom Sekretär der britischen Sektion des Amsterdamer Kongresses eine Zuschrift zugegangen, worin unsere Partei unter anderem befragt wird, ob sie geneigt wäre, an einer gemeinschaftlichen Beratung teilzunehmen, da beabsichtigt wäre, ein Nationales Comité einzusetzen, welches sich mit der Erledigung von Kongress Angelegenheiten beschäftigen soll. Wir haben uns gegen das Abhalten einer solchen Beratung ausgesprochen, und zwar hauptsächlich aus dem Grunde, dass nach der Zusammensetzung der britischen Sektion des Amsterdamer Kongresses, auf welchem unsere Partei vertreten war, zu schliessen, das in Vorschlag gebrachte Comité zweifellos aus Personen bestehen würde, welche in keinem Sinne des Wortes Sozialisten sind. In einen anderen Teile dieses Blattes veröffentlichen wir die volle hierauf bezügliche Correspondenz. Wir benutzen diese Gelegenheit, uns betreffs der wichtigen Erörterungen, welche darin zum Ausdruck gebracht werden, an die Socialistische Arbeiterschaft zu wenden.

Ein sorgfältiger, verständigvoller Beobachter der Verhandlungen früherer Internationaler Kongresse muss die Ueberzeugung gewonnen haben, dass diese Kongresse besonders durch dass unentschiedene Wesen ihrer Organisation gekennzeichnet waren und dass demzufolge noch jetzt viel Verwirrung hinsichtlich der wahren Absichten der auf diesen Kongressen gefassten Beschlüsse besteht.

Man muss wohl gestehen, dass bei Internationalen Kongressen gewisse Gefahren und Schwierigkeiten unabwendbar sind, doch behaupten wir, dass die von uns erwähnten bedauernden Resultate im grossen Masse dem Umstande zuzuführen sind, dass an diesen Kongressen Körperschaften und Personen teilnehmen, welche weder das Wissen noch die Berechtigung besitzen, die Interessen des Proletariats zu vertreten.

Die Socialistische Partei von Grossbritannien wird in dieser Ueberzeugung durch hier wohl bekannte Tatsachen bestärkt, Tatsachen, welche die Prinzipien vieler Teilnehmer am Amsterdamer Kongresse deutlich an den Tag legen. Unsere Delegierten auf diesem Kongresse sahen zu ihrem Leidwesen, dass Körperschaften wie die Independent Labour Party, das Labour Representation Committee, die Social-Democratic Federation und die Fabian Society als Socialistische Vereinigungen Einlass zum Kongresse begehrt und fanden.

Und daher kam es, dass Beschützer des Kapitalismus, Verteidiger der Kindersklaverei, Freunde der Versteinerungs- und Reformpolitik und Werkzeuge der Bourgeois Reaktion im Allgemeinen sich als Revolutionäre aufspielten, den Namen und das Ideal des Sozialismus schandeten und die arbeitende Klasse in ihren Anschauungen betreffs der wichtigsten Fragen in elender Weise verirrten.

Die Independent Labour Party und die Social-Democratic Federation lassen sich beide herbei, Vertretern der kapitalistischen Klasse Hülfe zu leisten; die Führer der Independent Labour Party nehmen in ihrem offiziellen Organe entschieden gegen den Klassenkampf Stellung, während die Social-Democratic Federation in ihrem Organe "Justice" sich deutlich dahin ausspricht, dass es Gelegenheiten gäbe, bei welchen das Bestehen des Klassenkampfes zum Vortheile des Emanzipation erstrebenden Proletariats vergessen werden dürfte. Die Fabian Society ist keine Vereinigung der arbeitenden Klasse und erstrebt in der Tat nur den Staats-Kapitalismus. Das Labour Represen-

tation Committee is not a mere committee, but a body of men and women who are not only the representatives of the working class, but also the representatives of the whole of the Liberal Party and the whole of the Socialist Party.

Die Sozialistische Partei von Grossbritannien wird daher die Aufforderung aussprechen, an das Parlament Verrat zu üben und sich selbst zu entkräften, so durch dass sie sich an der in Vorschlag gebrachten Beratung beteiligt, weil sie durch solche Teilnahme den besagten Körperschaften das Recht zugestehen würde sich mit der Durchführung der Beschlüsse des Kongresses, welche die Interessen des Internationalen Proletariats betreffen, zu beschäftigen.

In der Absicht dahin zu wirken, dass den künftigen Internationalen Kongress eine entschiedene Sozialistische Richtung und Bestimmung gegeben wird, wird jeder wahre Sozialistische Parteimitglied die entsprechende verhältnismässige Vertretung auf diesem Kongress gesichert werden, hat die Sozialistische Partei von Grossbritannien beschlossen, den Internationalen Kongress und den Sozialistischen Parteimitgliedern, welche sich an dem Kongress beteiligen, eine Vorlage zu unterbreiten in der Erwartung dass für die Zukunft soweit als möglich Massnahmen getroffen werden, welche die bestehende Verwirrung aus der Welt schaffen und der internationalen Arbeiterbewegung eine einheitliche und revolutionäre Richtung verleihen werden.

DER VORSTAND

DER SOZIALISTISCHEN PARTEI VON GROSSBRITANNIEN.
London, Januar, 1905.

The Dignity of Labour, at Home and Abroad.

ONE of the chief complaints of the capitalist-class and its parasites is that the native at home and abroad does not fully appreciate the "dignity of labour." It is in vain that so mild and popular a reformer as John Ruskin has pointed out that to labour with the hands all day is degrading, for the capitalist maintains that labour is dignified—if it is performed by someone else.

Labour, manual labour, is good, wholesome, and above all, necessary; but whatever of dignity it may have possessed in the days of handicraft has been lost amidst the whirl of machinery. To labour hour after hour, day after day, year after year, at some mechanical work is wholly degrading, nor can any amount of education awaken the power of thought in minds dulled by the excess of purely mechanical labour.

That useful machine called the worker, whose engine, the mind, is stoked with the rubbish and lies of newspapers and politicians, can work only along the lines laid down for him by the master-class. That, at least, is the intention of the capitalist, and not until the worker realises that his interests are entirely antagonistic to those of his owner will he make any real progress. He will then cease to cry for "work" as the remedy for the evils of unemployment; he will not demand the expulsion of alien labour from England, nor will he work himself into a passion because Chinese labour is introduced into South Africa. He will rather find in all such troubles the natural results of the modern system of production for profit instead of for use.

The South African Labour question is a typical case. The possible employment of white men is not to be considered: the white worker is too apt to demand a fair wage and a vote; he does not realise the dignity of cheap labour; he forms trade unions and other unpleasant societies. The white labour market is already over-stocked and unemployment is rife in South African towns. The question is whether the Kaffir, Indian, or Chinaman is to appreciate the "dignity of labour" in the mines, and the "Bloemfontein Weekly Post" explains why alien labour is necessary. The attitude of the native is the cause of the trouble. To begin with, he is better off than his fellow in England. In our country the English native has no possessions, is divorced from, and not permitted to cultivate, the soil, and is forced, therefore, to sell himself in the labour market for the mere cost of subsistence. In "our" colony, however, the native is allowed to squat on the land, paying little or nothing to the farmer. He can cultivate the soil without becoming the farmer's servant, and sometimes the farmer even enters into an alliance with the native and they work the land on the "half" system, which is unsparingly condemned by those in want of cheap labour, and who urge that the native should be nothing but a servant.

This custom among many of the farmers has made cheap labour scarce, and the "Bloemfontein

Weekly Post" suggests the remedy for this "bad state of things." It is found that the "dignity of labour" is less on the native, for he does not want work, and prefers revelling in the pleasures of sun and shade, and waxing fat on meales and Kaffir beer. When we remember how in England the master-class urges the workers to lead this simple, thrifty life, we may well be amused to find the same class falling foul of the native for that very reason, and it shows how little reliance is to be placed in the Christian ethics of capitalism.

So the native's "life of ease" is a source of annoyance to his would-be employers, and the "Bloemfontein Weekly Post" suggests that the farmers in Orange River Colony—no longer a free state—should be forced to employ the natives as servants or else turn them off their farms, for "the native must work." "There need be no forcing," says this paper, only he must be taxed so heavily that he is compelled to sell himself and live laborious days in order to exist. In fact, he must occupy the same position in his country as we English workers do in our country. Otherwise, it is suggested, "Indians should be imported on the same system of indenture as is adopted in Natal." That is to say, if the native cares naught for the "dignity of labour," he must be compelled to enslave himself or else alien labour must be imported.

It is absurd and useless for the English wage-slave to complain that his masters told him that the Boer War would open up a new market for his labour; it is, and always has been, evident that the capitalist is indifferent whether yellow, white, or black labour is used—cheapest is best. Socialists continually warn the wage-slave that when he fights he is not fighting for the benefit of himself, but of his master. If, instead of crying over spilt milk, he begins to study his own affairs from the point of view of his own class-interests, he will realise that every catch phrase, "dignity of labour," "glory of England," etc., is a species of bait to lure him on to his own destruction.

A real "dignity of labour" may be found if he labours for the "glory of England," and of all other countries, in the ranks of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, for the overthrow of Capitalism and the establishment of that Socialist Republic which is the aim and ideal of the International working-class.—SYDNEY CHASE.

THE LAW-LOVING CAPITALIST.

"Hardly any infringement of the Factory Acts is more difficult to discover or proceed against than the employment of a woman within four weeks of her confinement, chiefly owing to the burden of proof resting with the inspector as to the employer's knowledge of the facts. Although we have good reason to believe that such employment occurs frequently in certain districts, only one clear case, namely, this one, has yet occurred within our knowledge as suitable for proceedings, and in this case it was owing to the fact that the woman was sent for by the foreman, who was pressed for workers, on the ninth day after her confinement, although he had been informed of the reason of her absence on the day she left the mill. This unfortunate woman, although she made some attempt to screen her employers when called as a witness by Miss Squire (the factory inspector), was nevertheless dismissed from her employment after the result of the case (conviction and small penalty) was known. She obtained employment from one of the magistrates who heard her case soon afterwards, and thus removed her personal difficulties; it would do little or nothing, however, to counteract the effect on the workers' minds of the conduct of the employer, who, by dismissing her, showed his contempt for the law and the kind of course he was likely to pursue with any worker who admitted facts as to infringements of the law to one of H.M. Inspectors."—Extract from Annual Report of Inspectors of Factories.

We regret that exceptional pressure upon our space has compelled us to hold over an interesting article on "Physical Deterioration and Education," by our comrade Kate Hawkins. This article will appear in our next issue.

PARTY NOTES.

During the month of January there will be two meetings of the Executive Committee, viz., Saturday 7th at 3 p.m., and Tuesday 17th at 7 p.m.

Since the election of the present Executive Committee, there have been three vacancies created by the resignation of Comrades E. Allen, H. Hawkins, and Woodhouse. The latter is now in the United States in pursuit of a livelihood and has, I am sure, the best wishes of every member of the Party. The following members have been elected to the Executive to fill the vacancies: T. A. Jackson, A. Barker and F. S. Leigh.

A Branch has been formed in Tottenham. The Secretary is Leslie Royle, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N., who will be glad to hear of anyone desirous of joining.

The Quarterly Delegate Meeting to receive and deal with the report of the Executive Committee will be held at the Communist Club at 6.30 p.m. on Saturday, 21st January. Each Branch is entitled to send two delegates. Credential forms have been sent to the Branches, and Branch Secretaries should see that each Credential issued is properly filled up.

In order that the Quarterly Report of the Executive Committee may be completed, will Branch Secretaries please note that the Reports of Branches (Form C) should be forwarded so as to reach the Central Office by Saturday, 7th inst. if possible.

Membership Cards for 1905 are now ready. Each Branch Secretary should send at once to Comrade J. McNicol, Assistant Secretary, 179, Isledon Road, Finsbury Park, London, N., a list containing the registered numbers of those members for whom new cards are required. The member's full name and address may be given in each case, but the registered number is all that is necessary.

All remittances from Branches to the Party Funds should be sent to Comrade McNicol who transacts the Secretariat work as far as Party Finances are concerned. All remittances in connection with payment for copies of The Socialist Standard, advertisements therein, etc., should be sent to Comrade Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.

Articles, Branch Reports, and all other matter intended for insertion in the columns of The Socialist Standard should be forwarded to 5, Arvon Road, Highbury, N. If members and other readers would follow out these instructions considerable trouble and delay will be obviated.

Ill health has compelled our Comrade Dowdeswell to cease his work in connection with the Lecture List. For the present the duties have been taken up by Comrade T. A. Jackson, 408, St. Anne's Road, Harringay, N. It is to be hoped that with the advent of more genial weather, Comrade Dowdeswell will again be in form and at his old post.

Members should use their best endeavours to secure subscribers to The Socialist Standard. Subscription forms can be had on application to Comrade Anderson. A subscription form enclosed in each letter to friends likely to be interested would bring good results.

The object of true education is not merely to make people do the right things, but enjoy the right things; not merely pure but to love purity; not merely just, but to hunger and thirst after justice.—Goethe.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION.

I.—PROBLEM.

The problem that Socialism sets itself to solve is to be found in a fact, of which it can be said as of the sun: he is blind who does not see it. It is the divorce between the means of production and the producers.

Neither are the mines in the hands of the workers underground who give them value at the daily peril of their lives; nor do the railroads belong to those who have been called the slaves of the iron-way; nor do the weavers who work the looms, the spinners who toil at the spinning machine, the smiths of the blast furnace, etc., possess the smallest title to call their own that which they create and which occupies the greater and best portion of their lives—lives spent in barren and useless sacrifice; and, the economic development of Society tends to generalise this state of things by destroying naturally and necessarily the small industries, founded on the ownership of the means of production by the producer.

Next to industry, properly so-called, we find commerce and agriculture, on the expropriation of the little tradesman and peasant proprietor, organised on a large scale and monopolised by the non-producers.

Labour is, on the one hand, more and more furnished by a class; Property or Capital, on the other, held and controlled by another class. Here you have workers without property—the proletariat. There you see property without work—or capital.

It is this separation between the two factors of production which produces all the evils, all the disorders which afflict not only wage-workers but Society as a whole.

The workers without property are excluded from their products, from the riches they create—which accumulate in the hands of the property-holders, capitalists and large land-owners.

Labour, which is inseparable from the workman, is in effect nothing more than a commodity—like old bags, bicycles, bones, or biscuits—submitted to the laws which rule the prices of commodities and drag it down through the ups and downs of supply and demand to the mere expenses of living and reproduction of the species—food and maintenance; and, these expenses tend constantly to further reduction, because, to derive an advantage from the markets, capitalists, whatever their personal sentiments—had they the heart of a Saint Vincent de Paul or a Louise Michel—are obliged to reduce to a minimum their net cost which includes all labour, manual and mental.

There is then a universal and forced tendency to reduce to the lowest the workers' wages, and this law is sufficient to crush all the best intentions of employers, prisoners of the social order, by which, however, they benefit.

Another cause by virtue of which wages cannot rise—whatever may be the productivity of human labour—above the immediate wants of the working-class is that the supply of labourers tends ever more and more to outrun the demand.

The increase of supply results from the forcing into the ranks of the proletariat of the expropriated in small industries, little tradesmen, shopkeepers, all reduced, in their turn, to selling their power of doing work—their labour-power—in order to eat.

The decrease in the demand for labour results from the introduction of machinery and its extension. The non-human labour-power (steam, electricity, &c.), replaces and renders more and more useless human labour-power. Here is what we call progress in the economic system: the never-ceasing reduction of the sum of labour necessary to a given production.

The economists pretend, it is true, that this reduction in the field of human labour-power (the only means of existence of a class) is but temporary. Following a better market, the pro-

duce, more in demand, would bring in its train an increasing flow of production and a new demand for labour-power. But the economists might just as well say that the mechanical manufacture of coffins would multiply the need of coffins. Is not the mechanical production of bottles or casks dependent on the production of wine, beer, etc., and is not the output of rails or boilers limited by the number of factories and the development of the means of communication? On the other hand, neither the agricultural machinery (steam ploughs, sowers, mowers, binders and thrashers) nor the cranes on the quays multiply the products; they simply displace manual labour. But even in the industries where the machine has resulted in an extraordinary increase of manufactured articles, the demand for labour has diminished. Example: The cotton industry in England, in which the productivity has increased 1231 per cent. from 1819-22 to 1880-82, while for the same period the number of those employed fell from 1/37th of the population (445,000 out of a population of 16,500,000) to 1/50th (686,000 out of a population of 34,000,000). Another example: The boot and shoe trade of the United States carried from 70 million pairs in 1845 to 448 millions in 1875, while the workers employed have fallen from 1/414 (45,900 out of 19 millions population) to 1/1145th (48,000 out of 55 millions).

Under the system of non-possession by the working-class of the instruments with which they work, all progress, no matter what its nature, is turned against them, making greater their misery, their slavery; accentuating the insecurity of their existence; in a word: making unavoidable their exploitation—their robbery.

I spoke just now of the machine. Can it be possible that it could not have released suffering humanity from over-toil, troubles; could not have given us liberty? On the contrary, it has aggravated man's hard labour by setting up in competition with him women, transformed into toilers, and children. From the very moment that it permitted the employment of feminine and infantile arms, it was necessary that the woman should enter the factory, leaving behind her health, her dignity; compromising even the very race itself, attacked by the foul virus of capitalism while yet a fetus in its mother's womb. The effect of this competition let loose between the different members of the worker's family has been still a further lowering of labour. Thus the legend of the well-being of the family enforced by more bread-winners does not hold good even before a Jules Simon. When the woman and the child were not industrialised, the wages of the husband had to suffice for the maintenance of all. To-day, for the same price with which the single labour-power of the man was bought, the employer buys the threefold labour-power of the man, the woman, and the child.

The discovery of gas, this creation of human industry, of a midnight sun to prolong and complete that of day, has not been less fatal than the machine for the working-class. It has given place to night work, the slaughter-house of night.

And the instruction that is being extended—and which we are the first to applaud as a new element for the destruction of existing Society—what consequences do you think it is going to introduce for the proletariat as long as this Society exists? In perfecting the human tool, which produces more and better, it will create new stoppages, longer slack seasons. One instructed workman will be sufficient where formerly two ignorant workmen were necessary—and occupied.

We hear "profit sharing" much spoken of as a remedy to heal all social sores, to reconcile labour and capital. If the cure were applicable, profit sharing would only remove the field of battle to a conflict over the profits to be shared. But without insisting on this point, in urging the worker to produce the most possible, it would only oblige him to do in two days the work of three, concluding consequently in the multiplication of the already too numerous days of no pay or stoppages. From the hell in which the dispossessed productive class struggles and writhes there is no redemption—"abandon all hope ye who enter here!"

The social consequences of the rupture, ever

more complete, between labour and capital are no less terrible. First, we have the struggle of all against all.

It is the fashion amongst the adversaries of Socialism—through ignorance or enmity—to charge us with fomenting the class war. Just as though we had invented it! We do nothing but state it and make it serve, which is better, to its own ends. We know that the first condition which imposes itself on a doctor who is called to combat a disease is to examine it in order to understand it. It is not by shutting our eyes to the war which divides and exhausts humanity that we shall arrive at the desired peace. This war of every moment is three-fold:

War between the proletariat and the capitalist for their respective shares in the produce; on one side, wages, on the other, profits; each side exerting itself to carry off a maximum. Man becomes a wolf for his fellow-man. It is a question of eating one's brother or being eaten by him.

War between workers and workers for the sharing of wages.

War between capitalists and capitalists for the sharing of profits.

On the other hand, all the marvels of human genius, all conquests over nature, of which I have pointed out already the homicidal results to the working-classes, do not strike less mortally at the other classes of Society. The colours of aniline, coal extracts, so extensively used in the dyeing industry, have ruined whole districts which lived on the cultivation of the madder root formerly employed in this industry before the discovery of chemical dyes. Tomorrow, as has been recently foreshadowed, means may be discovered for the direct manufacture by electricity of metal-castings, and then the blast-furnaces, their fires extinguished, will leave to the millionaire of yesterday nothing but eyes to weep. All discoveries are condemned to operate only through revolutions, leaving behind them victims by the million, at the top as well as at the bottom of the social ladder.

It is, according to the admirable expression found in the programme of the German Socialist Democracy: *General insecurity becomes the normal condition of Society.*

What shall we say, in conclusion, of the over-production which goes on increasing and multiplying and which nothing can stop? When industry was yet confined to one or two countries, in order to reduce the frequency of these crises born of the ever growing division between the unbounded productivity of human labour and the limit put to the reward of the workers, outlets were furnished by exportation to those parts of Europe remaining agricultural (Italy, Germany, etc.). To-day, having become in their turn industrial, these same nations are confronted with over-production, and Africa and Asia are "opened up"—civilized—to supply markets for this too great store of commodities. Here you have an explanation also of the crimes of Colonial policy, Colonial wars, etc. which are the order of the day with Capitalist Governments. But after? They will only have stepped back in order to jump the better.

Thus more and more has Capitalist Society proved its horrible failure to produce anything from a superabundance of riches; of means of consumption and happiness, but misery, suffering, ruin and death!

Translated from the French of JULES GUESDE by P.J.T.

In the huge mass of evil, as it rolls and swells, there is ever some Good working imprisoned; working towards deliverance and triumph.
T. CARLYLE. "French Revolution."

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Branches and members should purchase their literature through the Party Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W. Write for particulars as to terms, etc.

CENTRAL ECONOMIC CLASS.

The class meets weekly and is free to all. On application to J. Fitzgerald, 34, Wilmington Square, London, W.C., full particulars will be sent.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

To facilitate the transaction of the business of the Editorial and Management Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to conduct its official Organ, members of the Party and other readers are particularly requested to address all literary communications to the *Editorial Committee, 5, Arden Road, Highbury, N.*, and all business correspondence, including Subscriptions and Advertisements, to *A. Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.*

(Signed) C. LEHANE, Secretary,
Editorial and Management Committee.

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months ... £ 5 s. 6 d.
Six Months ... £ 3 s. 0 d.

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion ... £ 5 s. 6 d.
Quarter Column do. ... £ 3 s. 0 d.
Half Column do. ... £ 1 s. 0 d.
One Column do. ... £ 1 s. 0 d.

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,
SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1905.

PEACE ON EARTH.

WHY from thousands of pulpits Christian preachers are asking for "peace on earth, good-will toward men" we find war between classes and war between nations everywhere manifest. If we take but a short period of ten years we shall find that every civilised country has been engaged either in war or in oppressing subject races. America with Spain and with the Philippines; France in Madagascar and in Algeria; Russia with Japan and with the Manchus; Germany with the Hereros; Holland with the Javanese; Britain everywhere: thus the tale of war is told.

We who are Socialists are all in favour of peace, but at the same time we recognise that so long as men live in societies based upon class opposition, in societies in which the modes of producing the material sustenance of man are monopolised by a class, so long will war be rife as a means of satisfying national disputes.

The fact that one class monopolises all that is best in life because of its owning the means of production, while another class possesses nothing but its power of labour, has to sell that power in order to gain a mere livelihood, is the primary cause of the war of classes. Each class seeks to better its condition. And this is only possible at the expense of the other class. A rise in wages for the worker is a fall in the profits of the employer. A reduction of hours for the worker beyond certain limits is at the expense of the employer's surplus-value. This opposition between employer and employed manifests itself not only in the striving for better wages and reduced hours, but throughout the whole of the ramifications of modern industrial society.

The production of commodities is to-day production for the market. During periods of prosperity production is carried on by all manufacturers with great intensity. This production is furthered by means of the "credit" system, which allows of capital being borrowed and material being bought on credit. When, as the result of all the rival manufacturers turning out their goods as quickly as possible, the market becomes glutted, it becomes necessary to somehow convert these goods into money in order to discharge their liabilities. The usual markets being glutted, it is ever more necessary to extend the limits of the market, to secure fresh outlets, and the ordinary method of arriving at this end is to annex new territory and develop its resources.

Thus arising from the very course of commerce itself comes the necessity of carrying on wars of aggression. War to-day is essentially commercial, and at all times has been at base economic. Whether it is the ancient commercial feud of Athens and Argos, the jealousy of Rome of its commercial rival, Carthage; the desire of Rome to conquer the lands adjoining the Mediterranean and thereby possess a monopoly of that sea which was then the world's commercial highway; peasant wars, servile wars, feudal wars, or modern wars of aggression like the recent Boer War; whichever of these they be, they are fundamentally economic, and in the interests, not of the whole people, but of the ruling class.

And when such wars do arise they always receive the support of the Church within their own nation, which is so ready at other times to prate of "peace on earth." While having no quarrel with religion as such, we cannot but recognise that the official church in any country is the worthy bulwark of the ruling class in that country, and that towards that most reactionary of churches, the Roman Catholic, the propertied class are drifting more and more.

When the Church is prepared to advocate and to hasten the downfall of the present industrial system—the cause of modern wars—and to substitute therefor a society based upon social equality from which no wars can possibly spring, we shall be the more willing to believe in their protestations in favour of peace. But to-day they cry peace! peace! where there is and can be no peace.

Each of the forms of war—the outcome of the existing capitalist system—carries in its train results both dire and disastrous for the working people. Whether national or industrial warfare is the more distressing and far-reaching in its results may be difficult to determine from actual tabulated statistics, but after a minute examination of both we have no hesitation in saying that industrial warfare has far the greater number of victims.

Enormous, as have been the victims of battles like Borodino, Sedan, or the Sha-ho; great as is the estimate of 2,000,000 men killed in battles between fairly civilised powers in the 25 years from 1855 to 1880, greater still has been the sacrifice to industrialism. Let us calculate the number of children dying in their first year from remediable causes, the number of accidents on the railway or in the mine, the early deaths of the workers from living in insanitary dwellings and working in insanitary factories and workshops with insufficient nourishment for their daily fare, and we shall see that the industrial warfare is as severe as the national. When we remember that the number of those killed and injured on American railways during the past year exceeded the 45,000 casualties of the Sha-ho battle we shall see that it is as necessary to consider means for the removal of the warfare of peace as of that of war.

We may be excused if we give two extracts, one showing the horrors of the battle-field, the other the terrors of the factory.

The first is from Dr. Russell, of the "Times," who wrote the following account of the battle of Sedan:

"Let your readers fancy masses of coloured rage glued together with blood and brains, and pinned into strange shapes by fragments of bones; let them conceive men's bodies without heads, legs without bodies, heaps of human entrails attached to red and blue cloth, and disembowelled corpses in uniform, bodies lying about in all attitudes with skulls shattered, faces blown off, hips smashed, bones,

flesh, and gay clothing all pounded together, as if brayed in a mortar, extending for miles, not very thick in any one place, but recurring perpetually for weary hours, and then they cannot, with the most vivid imagination, come up to the sickening reality of that butchery."

Thus of war! and now of peace! Our extract is from Dr. Tatham's Report on "The Mortality of Occupations." He says:

"At the last census (1891) male cotton and flax operatives above the age of 15 numbered 179,359 in the aggregate having increased since 1881 by 11 per cent. At ages below 45 years the mortality of cotton operatives scarcely differs from the average among textile workers, but at each group of ages above 45 the rates are considerably in excess of the average. Compared with the standard for occupied males the death-rates are excessive at all ages over 25 years and under 45 years. The comparative mortality figure of these workers from all causes at ages 25-65 is 1,141, considerably exceeding that of textile workers generally; while compared with that of occupied males it is in excess by 20 per cent. Cotton operatives die half as fast again as the standard from diseases of the respiratory system; their mortality also shows an excess of two-fifths from diseases of the nervous system, and of the digestive organs other than the liver, and an excess of one-fifth from circulatory diseases. They also suffer more than the average from phthisis, influenza, diabetes, and suicide, whilst, in common with textile workers generally, their mortality from alcoholism and liver disease is below, but that from rheumatic fever is above the average."

True, the first of these pictures is far more horrible than the second, but we have a Sedan only once in thirty years or more, while we have the remediable terrors of factory life with us day by day.

By all means let us have peace, but let us work for it by trying to remove the cause of war—our present industrial system. When society is no longer a crystallised selfishness, when the condition of man's living is no longer at the expense of his neighbour, when anarchy is no longer the phase of production of commodities, when, instead of all these, men live, owning the material means of subsistence in common, and men and women can obtain the satisfaction of their needs without having to sell their labour force for a bare subsistence, then it will no longer be necessary to speak of peace, for peace will then be a living reality.

Those who really desire that peace should reign over all the earth, who see peace between men as a condition of healthy industrial and social development should join with us of The Socialist Party of Great Britain in organising that party which shall preach those principles of industrial harmony based upon the abrogation of class privilege and the holding of all means of production and of distribution in common, which shall be the basis upon which shall be built up a peace which shall endure and which shall extend throughout the world-wide co-operative Commonwealth.

THE plain message physical science has for the world at large is this, that were our political and social and moral devices only as well contrived to their ends as a linotype machine, an antiseptic operating plant, or an electric tram-car, there need now at the present moment be no appreciable toil in the world, and only the smallest fraction of the pain, the fear, and the anxiety that now make human life so doubtful in its value. There is more than enough for everyone alive. Science stands, a too competent servant, behind her wrangling, underbred masters, holding out resources, devices, and remedies they are too stupid to use.

—H. G. WELLS in "Fortnightly" for December.

A LOOK ROUND.

ACCORDING to a memorandum prepared by the Labour Department of the Board of Trade, there were in existence at the end of 1903, 1,166 trade unions, with a total membership of 1,902,308, as compared with 1,190 unions with 1,924,809 members at the end of 1902, a decrease in membership of 22,501. The number of women and girls included as members in 1903 was 119,416, as compared with 122,210 at the end of 1902, a decrease of 2.3 per cent. The decline was chiefly in the cotton trade unions and followed upon a period of unsettled employment in the cotton trade.

The total funds in hand for the 100 principal trade unions were £4,550,000, about £4 per member. The amount paid in unemployed benefit showed an increase of £80,000.

The acuteness of the unemployed problem in West Ham has caused much discussion in the Press, and a few days before Xmas various "Relief" funds were opened. Vague references to "revolutions" and "riots" have been indulged in, but surely no one expects that starving men or physical deteriorates could sustain any organised revolutionary effort. The advice of Will Thorne, who "asked the men to behave themselves as they walked through the borough, and so show the governing classes that they knew how to conduct themselves although they were poor," has been followed, although what on earth men who have already lost what little they ever had, including, in many cases, the franchise (through accepting Poor Law Relief) have to gain by "behaving themselves," is very difficult to understand!

In this connection the letter of Councillor McAllen (S.D.F.) which appeared in the morning papers is interesting. He said "Alarm is felt by the local authorities that the seriousness of the distress may precipitate a crisis, which would be attended with deplorable results. This must be avoided at all hazards!" We again ask what have the unemployed to lose, and what results could be more deplorable to them than those which have already overtaken them? One would imagine that these Revolutionary Social-Democrats, who preach peace where there is no peace, hold a brief for the propertied class.

During the agitation, various leaders of the capitalist political party have been deputed by Jack Jones, A. Hayday, Salmon and others. As we have already pointed out, we do not agree with holding any parleys with either section of the workers' enemies. In the first place, the issue is confused and the workers are led to believe that the social problem can be dealt with otherwise than by the overthrow of capitalist domination, and in the second place, if the capitalist politicians are asked to do certain things, and they reply favorably, those who ask them are morally bound to support them in their efforts. As Herbert Gladstone retorted, in reply to interruptions by J. J. Terrett and others, as to why the Liberals do not do this, that, or the other,

"If you want the Liberal Party to do these things, then help them to win elections and thus place them in a position to do them."

Herein lies one of the chief causes of the disagreement between The Socialist Party of Great Britain and others claiming to be Socialists. We would just as soon expect that burglars and pickpockets would organise themselves for the purpose of devising and carrying out means for the protection of the public against burglary and pocket-picking as we would expect the capitalist-class to carry measures for dealing with the unemployed problem. We tell the workers that there can be no solution except by the establishment of the Socialist Republic; that the capitalist politicians, whether labelled Liberal or Conservative, desire to maintain the capitalist State, in which a reserve army of unemployed is a necessity, and under no circum-

stances will we beg and pray them, or appeal to them—our class enemies—to do something which we know they will not do. The workers must accomplish their own emancipation, organised as a Socialist Party, independent of and hostile to all other parties. That emancipation will never be obtained otherwise.

What can be said of professing Socialists, claiming to believe in the class-war and all that that belief involves, delivering speeches like the following:

"Perhaps it was best to have a friend in both parties. If they succeeded in getting one Liberal leader and one Tory to do something in the matter they would have succeeded in making the question a national one, and probably from both sides of the House they would get sufficient support to carry out some scheme."

The most charitable view is that the speaker (Jack Jones) allowed his feelings to get the better of his Socialist convictions, owing to the extraordinary amount of distress existing in the district.

As is usual just previous to a General Election, the Liberal papers are endeavouring to show how much superior would be the government by that capitalist faction to that of the Conservatives. But in doing so they have to give away their own case so far as the alleged prosperity of the country, due to Free Trade, is concerned. In a recent speech Mr. Birrell declared

"We long to see the energy of our party directed towards an honest attempt to do, at all events, something to solve the problems of poverty and suffering. This world will never be a Utopia, but we want to make it a little less like Hell than it is for millions of our people."

And in commenting on this, a Liberal writer adds:

"And who is there of human instincts, whatever his political leanings, that does not sympathise with those millions whose life is a dreary struggle, whose steps are dogged by chronic want, whose children cry for food and warmth, and cry in vain. England, the richest country in the world, counts millions of these. Poor, struggling millions! Surely the social and economic system is out of joint that allows the few to amass unmeasured wealth while the very bread of life is wanting to thousands who would earn it if they could. We speak not of the idle, improvident and intemperate, but of the honest, industrious and independent poor; these latter even are counted by millions, and their lot is hard indeed."

Observe! After fifty years of Free Trade, at the end of "a century of amazing progress" during which our wealth has increased from £140 to £303 per head of the population, our "honest, industrious and independent poor are counted by millions." "Here is an opportunity for Liberalism" proceeds the scribe. Yes, an opportunity to make this world "a little less like Hell than it is for millions of our people." Only that and nothing more! Capitalism is Hell for the workers. There is only one way by which they can get out of it, and that is by organising for the Revolution, by joining the Party of the Revolution, The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

In our last issue we dealt with the S.D.F., I.L.P., and L.R.C. members being induced to support the Liberal faction of the Capitalist Party at "Free Trade" meetings and we notice that H. Kirby deals with the same matter in "Justice." He describes Mr. Masterman, the Liberal candidate for North West Ham, as "an adept at trailing Liberal red herrings before the workers' noses." But we would remind Mr. Kirby that when Masterman contested Dulwich, one of the best-known members of the S.D.F., J. Hunter Watts, voted for him and urged other Social-Democrats to go and do likewise. Now, if Masterman was advanced enough for

such a leading revolutionary Social-Democrat as Hunter Watts, surely smaller fry should follow such a good example? Perhaps one of these days the S.D.F. will endeavour to pursue a consistent policy, but we are afraid it will then be too late for them to regain the public confidence.

There comes into force this year an agreement between the Lancashire and Yorkshire and the London and North Western Railway Companies, which they have entered into for fifty years. It is hoped that the co-operation which will give place to the competition hitherto existing between the two companies will result in a large reduction of expenses. Many trains will cease to run but there will be no inconvenience either to passengers or traders.

There will also be a general reorganisation in the goods departments, from which in some towns in Yorkshire a saving of £2,000 a year is expected.

This arrangement will no doubt throw a number of workers out of employment and the financial advantages will be secured by the shareholders. Such is capitalist co-operation—a step towards trustification. Under Socialism the more efficient organisation of any public service would benefit the whole community.

The Ups and Downs of a Poor Palliative would make an interesting article, if one had time to write up all the material connected with the S.D.F. proposal, which starting with the "One good meal a day free" advocated by H. Quelch, E. Sansom and others at the 1888 London School Board Election, gradually developed into Complete State Maintenance for all children. But recently many members of the S.D.F., so possessed have they become by the spirit of mere reform and the desire to win elections, have even gone back upon the crude proposals of 1888. At recent elections, Martin Judge (West Ham) advocated "Free Food for Starving Children," and A. C. Bannington (Coventry) running under the auspices of the Trades and Labour Council, advocated "Free wholesome meals for all school children who need them." And at the recent meeting at Canning Town, presided over by Will Thorne, the resolution moved by the Countess of Warwick (S.D.F.) was not in favour of State Maintenance, but merely

"That, with the view of checking the physical deterioration amongst our population, the Government should, in accordance with the demands of the Trade Union Congress, grant to the education authorities the power necessary to provide food for children attending State-supported schools."

Ex-Alderman Hayday seconded this resolution and other members of the S.D.F. present included Jack Jones. Thus we see Trade Union officials watering down the S.D.F. proposals to meet the wishes of the Unions.

At a recent meeting of the Reading Debating Society, J. F. Hodgson (S.D.F.) moved

"That this House would welcome the introduction by Government of a measure providing funds for the supply of free meals to school children."

This was supported by Messrs. Mackay, Leaver and Quelch, and carried. There's progress for you!

In looking through the programme of A. C. Bannington, referred to above, we find the following:

"Unskilled men to receive not less than 25s. per week,"

and in looking through the programme and rules of the Organisation to which we believe Bannington still belongs, we find that a minimum wage of 30s. is demanded as an immediate reform, and that a candidate's programme must be previously sanctioned (together with his election address) by the local Branch and by the Executive Council. But when some folks get the election fever, programmes and rules go by the board.

J. KAY.

THE PROSPECTS OF THE WORKERS' CHILDREN.

The class antagonism between exploiter and exploited, arising, as it does, out of the fundamental contradiction in the capitalist system of production, viz., the appropriation of the social product by the individual capitalist, naturally permeates the entire social organisation under Capitalism. Hence the children of the workers do not fare an iota better than their parents. There is but one difference, namely, that the parents could collectively take action with the view to their emancipation, while the children are powerless so far as securing their own welfare is concerned.

The capitalist-class naturally look upon the children of the working-class merely as the rising generation of wage-slaves, whose only justification for existence is sustained by the fact that they are the prospective producers of all wealth and luxury for the idle and useless master-class. The portion of wealth that under present conditions falls to the workers barely suffices for their miserable subsistence and the propagation of their kind. It therefore goes without saying that the conditions regulating the working-class standard of "vegetation" (to call it "standard of comfort" would be the most biting satire) apply in equal measure to the growing generation of the toiling-class.

Men and women who live in slums and hovels, who, when at work, are under-fed and over-worked, when out of work (nowadays of only too frequent occurrence) are literally starved; who, by their vile environment and conditions are thrown into vice and disease, cannot possibly reproduce children with strong, healthy physique, brilliant intellect, firm moral backbone and sense for the pure and beautiful.

The whole process of reproducing the wage-slave is evidently in full accord with the object of his future existence. It is not only when capable of wielding the instruments of production and exchange that the life of the worker is, at its best, deplorable; already while he is being prepared ("dragged up," would be a more fitting term to use) for his miserable task of wage-slavery, he experiences the bitter foretaste of adversity, to which, unfortunately, he grows accustomed in after-life.

During the period of pregnancy the average working-class woman is often over-worked and unable to obtain fresh air, sufficient and wholesome food and a healthy, decent environment. Were we but in a position to compile correct statistics with regard to the prenatal sufferings of the worker's child, the cruelty and the injustice of the present system would, if possible, become more disgusting and revolting to us. Born in surroundings of squalor and wretchedness, the child of the toiler is frequently from his birth ill-fed and neglected. The working-class mother being often a wage-slave, has, in cases out of number, to entrust the care of her infant to a person running a day-nursery on commercial lines. Further comment is superfluous. Being sent to school at three years of age the worker's child is soon compelled to forego romping and playing in favour of zealous attention to the study of the 3 R's, indispensable accomplishments for a sturdy producer of surplus-value.

To the child habitually under-fed, badly housed and insufficiently clothed, the knowledge imparted in the modern elementary school is indeed far too liberal an education, because in numerous cases it is absolutely wasted. Seeing that the child of the worker commences its career as a responsible wage-slave at the age of twelve, thirteen, or fourteen, it cannot be a matter for surprise to find that nearly one-third of the number of children attending public elementary schools are between three and seven years of age. The total number attending such schools in England and Wales were at the end of the school year of 1902-3, 5,967,868, of which number 1,858,590 were between the ages of three and seven.

Considering that at the present time the number of unemployed workers throughout the country is nearly approaching a million, which number is increasing daily, it is not difficult to gauge the number of starving and under-fed children in and out of school. The capitalist

employer who, prompted by sheer "patriotic zeal," is setting the workers of one country against those of another, has not the least compunction in employing—no doubt also for "patriotic reasons"—women and children of his native country in place of men of native birth. What wonder then, that, as the Blue Books of the Board of Education show, over a million of school children from 5 years upwards are engaged in laborious work in order to augment the earnings of their parents: at least, that is what the Government Inspectors say. The most recent Report of the Board of Education contains the information that of the 5,975,127 children who in 1902-1903 attended the public elementary schools of England and Wales, 237,629 stayed away every day throughout the year. Besides there were in that year 80,758 half-timers. These wretched children rise at five or six in the morning, tramp in all weathers to the factory and work there till noon, by which time their puny emaciated bodies are pretty well exhausted. Regardless of their being absolutely unfit for any brain work they are compelled to attend school in the afternoon. How peculiar that the kind-hearted capitalists should not prefer those half-timers working at the mill in the afternoon, so as to give them the opportunity of attending school in the morning, when their little brains are more fit for work than in the afternoon. But the ways that real kindness of heart pursues are as numerous as they are mysterious.

According to Blue Book statistics there are further about 200,000 children between 5 and 13 years of age who, attending school regularly, work after school hours from 15 to 40 hours per week, that is to say, in all from 45 to 75 hours per week.

Here I must remind you that Mr. Shackleton, M.P., the Chairman of the so-called British section of the recent International Socialist Congress, has until now persistently defended the necessity of child labour.

Comprehending as we do, that the children of the workers are compelled by a Capitalist Government to attend school for the purpose of being trained for their future vocation in life, viz., to be victims of capitalist exploitation, we fully realize that the whole system of education for the workers' children is based upon the principle of "Little science with reactionary deductions, heaps of superstition encouraging servility."

It is evident that teachers for the training of capable wage-slaves need not be particularly accomplished. Again, the Blue Book informs us that of the 157,281 teachers engaged in the elementary schools of England and Wales, 86,375 are not even certificated and consist of pupil teachers, probationers and article 68 (any female over 18 years of age, who has been vaccinated). 4,645 teachers are trained in colleges every year. Of 47 colleges, 32 belong to the Church of England, 12 to the Nonconformists and Catholics, and only 3 with 356 scholars are undenominational. It being impossible for the average child of the worker to take up teaching as its calling, owing to the expense and time involved in a course of training, the majority of elementary teachers spring from the lower middle-class, who naturally carry into their work the snobbery, jingoism and reaction so rampant among their class.

As to the school books used, history and science, in fact all subjects, more or less, are interpreted with a view to convincing the prospective toilers of the necessity for the existence of competition, class distinction and the struggle for a paltry sustenance for ever and ever.

Holding, as we of The Socialist Party of Great Britain do, that the social evils produced by Capitalism have reached a stage where peddling reforms enacted by a Capitalist Parliament can only have the effect of retarding working-class emancipation, it is our bounden duty to be up in arms against all those who, posing as champions of working-class interests, help to bolster up the capitalist system by assisting the capitalists in throwing a bone to the under-dog—the proletariat—in order to prevent him from attacking his tormentor—the capitalist-class.

Having existed now over 20 years, the Social-Democratic Federation has in recent years seen fit to abandon the propaganda of Socialism and

to devote its energies to promoting "Liberal-Labour" candidates, in an attempt to solve the unemployed problem under Capitalism by demanding from a Capitalist Government the calling of a special session of a Capitalist Parliament, and last but not least, to the agitation of "a meal a day for the children in public schools" (I assume it means breakfast). The capitalist-cum-labour "political machine" produces most staggering effects. Here a palliative which, enforced on Socialist lines (the only possible for Socialists), would start the "Social Revolution," is put into the aforesaid machine and, lo and behold! out comes a measure: "a meal a day for the children," promoted by Claude Hay, Sir John Gorst, "The S.D.F. Countess," and Co., which is received with wild rejoicing by the Social-Democratic Federation, for now at last their few "Labour seats" for Parliament appear absolutely safe. What matters that Socialism once more is dragged into the mire, so long as ambition for place and distinction is satisfied and the capitalist-class has been assisted in gulling the unwary workers.

It was until a year or two ago that the S.D.F. agitated for "Free Maintenance," which was always interpreted to mean that the children of the workers were to be adequately fed, clothed, and housed with the view to becoming sturdy citizens of a free and happy commonwealth. To-day, this "Reform" organisation stands (see "Justice" of December 17th last) for "a meal a day," that is an extension of the Poor Law system, which the capitalist-class is compelled to introduce in view of the growing unemployment among the workers. That a presumably Socialist organisation has, owing to the "distinguished" intervention by a "Knight" and a "Countess," consented to stand sponsor to a "capitalist offspring" is undoubtedly a feather in the cap of the "capitalist-cum-labour" caucus, which exists for arranging the diplomatic relations between capital and labour.

With regard to the prospects of the children of the working-class, we of The Socialist Party of Great Britain have, as respecting all other social evils endured by the toiling-class, no illusions whatever. Fully recognising the rottenness of the entire capitalist system, we regard it as a betrayal of the true interests of the working-class to encourage, let alone assist, any "patching up," which, after all, only means prolonging the agony.

The capitalist-class will, as we know, only concede what it is impossible to withhold from the workers. Hence the assistance by so-called Socialists in the granting of these concessions tends to throw the working-class completely off the path of class antagonism.

So soon as we fully understand that under such conditions and in such surroundings as described above it is impossible to give the child of the worker the scope of a full physical and mental development, we necessarily recognise that all measures promoted to improve present conditions only tend to further delay the advent of the economic freedom of the toiler and to prolong the suffering of his offspring. Surely it is not the business of the Socialist to assist in applying the brake to the wheel of human emancipation. But those would-be Socialists who join hands with the capitalist politicians in procuring a paltry meal for the little starvings of the working-class now conveniently ignore the fact that they flatly contradict the deductions they drew in the past from the economic causes and effects presented by the Capitalist System.

If the capitalists make a concession with one hand they recoup themselves with the other. They may provide a little food for the children in school, but as they will on no account suffer a reduction in the amount of their surplus value—seeing that they completely own and control the economic and political power of the State—the wages of the workers will go down and most likely to such degree that the little food the children will obtain at school will probably be all the food they will get. Besides, the class-unconscious workers are sure to take this concession on the part of the capitalist-class as a pure act of grace and not—as in reality it is—an economic necessity, especially when they see that an organisation posing as a Socialist Body has been amiably working with the capitalist to attain that end.

Now, it may be argued that even if the capit-

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

alists recoup themselves and the workers and their children consequently do not gain materially, and even become less class-antagonistic, yet the thin edge of the wedge has been inserted and the small concession will lead to full-fledged free maintenance of the children and hence to the Social Revolution. One may as well argue, as the "advanced Reformers" contend, that the workhouse system, if fully taken advantage of by the workers, would eventually abolish poverty, misery, and degradation. In fact, the once revolutionary S.D.F. to-day argues that providing you put a sufficient number of patches on a pair of old boots you will produce a new pair. But in order to be politically successful in the capitalist sense it is impossible to proceed on strictly logical and uncompromising lines.

We may further get reminded that Marx and Engels in their Communist Manifesto held that it was the duty of the proletariat, while working for the revolution, to endeavour to obtain every amelioration possible for their class. Our reply is that this pronouncement was made over fifty years ago and that since then Capitalism has developed to such an extent that, if Marx and Engels were alive to-day, they would fully agree with us that at the present time there is only one way of obtaining amelioration for the proletariat and that is to usher in the Socialist Republic as quickly as possible.

Further, if amelioration were possible, surely it could not be obtained by joining the capitalists in promoting measures prompted by economic necessity and the desire to stave off the collapse of Capitalism. How amelioration could at all be achieved unless enforced by the antagonism of the class struggle is for a Socialist impossible to comprehend.

It was such men as Marx, Engels, Lassalle and Liebknecht who wrought the enlightenment and knowledge that led to the elevation of Socialism to the powerful science and the political creed of the International proletariat. But apart from the great services these men rendered to mankind, we must not forget the devotion and faithfulness they at all times bore to the suffering proletariat, never flinching, never yielding, although at times bowed down by their own personal suffering, by their own individual misery.

Seeing in their teachings our guide, our refuge, and our hope for human emancipation, endeavouring to emulate their moral strength, their uncompromising revolutionary attitude, we invite all men and women of a similar mind to ours to rally and thus help us to keep aloft our banner: "No Reform, no Compromise—but complete, unconditional surrender of the existing capitalist forces in favour of the free and happy Socialist Republic."—H.N.

A Voice Crying in the Wilderness.

Extract from a speech by Mr. R. T. Manson, delivered at the Liverpool Church Congress, Oct 5th, 1904.

(From the official report, p. 249.)

And now it is pertinent to ask: What part are the clergy playing in this gruesome drama? The severest critic should not deny the numerous kindly offices in smaller matters which they constantly perform, all should unite in crediting the rectory and the vicarage with being the centres to which the weary and heavy-laden instinctively turn, there to receive not only the creature comforts of an hour, but consolations in the sorrows and assuagings of the griefs against which no material wealth is a barrier, nor robust health a guard. Of almsgiving and charity organisations there is no end, but the roots of the evil are too deep to permit of charity being a cure. There would be little need for charity if all had justice. The wealth of the mansion is the product of the dweller in the cottage, and the labourer is not only worthy of his hire but of all that he earns, and if that were paid to him there would be bought left for the landlord, and no occasion for the dole.

It is imperative, therefore, that it be asked in this assembly: Are the clergy on the side of the poor and lowly against the mighty and the rich? Do they advocate as they should the causes of the people who cry for better houses, and better wages, and better opportunities of living Christ-

ian and moral lives? Do they preach contentment to those who are wronged, and who should not be content? Is mediation sufficient where the disputants are so unequal as are the toiler of the hut and the lord of the castle? Do they palliate evils which they might assist to destroy, or condone with the wealth-getting which they should denounce? How many have the temerity to reprove a rich parishioner who has treated his labourer badly, as he would reprove the labourer who has served his master badly? The present social and commercial system would not allow of the interference, and willing martyrs are none too common; and so we have to face the question: Is that system based on justice and right? Is it moral and Christian that one man should seek toilsomely a bare, miserable subsistence, while another enjoys, with never an effort to produce it, extreme luxury? If it be not right, let us seek a peaceful and constitutional remedy.

In every country in the world today there is rapidly growing a movement consisting of those who say that production should be for use and not for profit; that it is competition and the absence of mutual interests which make the millionaire on the one hand and the thousands of casual labourers on the other; that it is possible and desirable to abolish both by the introduction of national co-operation; and by the

placing of all industries under governmental control. For if it be worthy of the attention of great departments of state to devote their abilities to the organising of armies and navies or post-offices, how much more desirable is it that similarly powerful departments of state should direct and control the unceasing and imperative production and distribution of the necessities of life? With the national control of labour, every able man would be sure of the opportunity of being employed, and those who were not employed would be known to be by nature and inclination idlers.

And that system will surely come when the people have been taught to say "We will it;" and in that time the Churches and the teachers may work with more hope of fulfilling their exalted mission, and prepare the world for that more ideal time, when it shall be said in the newer England, as it was to those old-time casual labourers in distant Galilee, "We will give unto this last, even as unto thee."

At Howbury Hall, Nuthall (two minutes from station), J. Kent will open a discussion upon Socialism on Tuesday, January 17th, at 8 p.m. All readers welcomed.

The receipt of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

CORRESPONDENCE

between The Socialist Party of Great Britain and the Secretary to the British Section at Amsterdam Congress, 1904.

40, Outer Temple, Strand,
London, W.C.
Nov., 1904.

C. Lehané,
The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
107, Charlotte St., London, W.

Dear Comrade,
In accordance with the decision of the British Section at the International Socialist Congress at Amsterdam, I am sending you herewith a precis of the minutes of the Section, signed by the Chairman and myself.

I shall be glad if you will bring the same before your organisation, and take the opinion of its members on the following questions arising thereout:—

- 1.—Are you in favour of a Conference being held with a view to the formation of a National Committee to deal with matters arising out of the Congress?
- 2.—Are you in favour of the rules for the conduct of business at future Congresses as proposed by Mr. John Hodge and agreed to by the British Section?
- 3.—Will you contribute annually to the funds of the International Socialist Bureau at Brussels, which consists of representatives of the various nationalities taking part in the Congress, and takes what action may seem necessary in the name of international socialism, including the organisation of the International Congresses?

Hoping to receive favourable replies to these questions at an early date.

I am, yours fraternally,
(Signed) J. F. GREEN.

(Secretary to British Section at Amsterdam Congress, 1904.)

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Central Office,
Communist Club,
107, Charlotte Street,
Fitzroy Square,
London, W.
Jan. 3, 1905.

J. F. Green,
(Secretary to British Section at Amsterdam Congress, 1904.)
40, Outer Temple, Strand, W.C.)

Comrade,
Your communication, covering precis of the minutes of the British Section at Amsterdam Congress 1904, has been received, and in reply I am instructed to state:—

1.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain is not in favour of holding the proposed conference, and will decline to take part therein if held. As the International Congress is presumably a Socialist Congress, the matters arising from out its decisions should be the task of the Socialist Party existing in the various countries to deal with. Judging from the composition of the British Section, according to the precis of the minutes you sent, the Committee that apparently you propose would consist of men who are in no sense of the word Socialist. The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, cannot see that any good purpose would be served by a Committee of men who are not agreed on basic principles tampering with these matters.

2.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain is not in favour of the rules for the conduct of business at future Congresses as proposed by Mr. John Hodge as it fails to see that any improvement would result from their adoption.

3.—The Socialist Party of Great Britain is, of course, perfectly willing to bear its fair share of the expenses of international organisation, but considers that it should communicate direct with the International Socialist Bureau regarding this matter.

I am,

Yours fraternally,
(Signed) C. LEHANE,
General Secretary.

SMART!

THE class struggle having been satisfactorily disposed of by Messrs. Keir Hardie and Bruce Glasier who have now proved beyond the possibility of doubt that the interests of the capitalist-class and the working-class are (more or less) identical and cannot by any chance breed conflict (except now and again), Mr. Russell Smart also of the I.L.P., not to be outdone, rushes into print to show how very easy of solution the unemployed problem really is when tackled by a member of the "practical" school of political economy. All that is required is to round up the existing unemployed and put them back to work on the land. As the machine in the factory turns out more, put them back on the land also. When they have acquired that degree of efficiency necessary to enable them to enter into effective competition with the established agricultural worker, then take the men displaced and put them back on the land! Put 'em all back! and then the problem will be solved and everybody will have work, and there shall be no more sighing and all tears shall be wiped away! It is all so simple that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not make a mistake. No wonder Russell Smart raises an indignant voice of protest against the absurdity of the contention of illogical, irresponsible, not to say ill-informed Socialists who with purblind fatuity hold that nothing short of Socialism will dispose of the problem adequately and finally. They are bringing discredit upon the movement. They have forgotten "the land." They talk as if the capitalist system were based upon profit; as if profits were affected by the existence or otherwise of a surplus of labour on the market; as if the elimination of competition for work would mean the diminution of profit; whereas it is well known that the very reverse is the case. It is well known that the capitalist system is not concerned with profit; that if it were the profit has no relation to the amount of competition for work; that as a matter of actual fact if the demand for labour were greater than the available supply—if, for example, there were 2 jobs for every one man—if the profits were affected at all they would be greater for the simple reason that worker, seeing the difficulty of the capitalist to get the work covered; knowing that if the work was not done there could be no return on the capital, which would mean that the capitalist would commence to consume his reserve of wealth and would presently be entirely without means; knowing further that Capital and Labour are brothers (*vide* Keir Hardie and Bruce Glasier); knowing all this the worker would, for the good of trade, the glory of the flag, and the honour of the empire, gladly enough do the work of two men for the price of one (or one and a half), finding sufficient happiness in the unwonted possession of plenty of work to recompense him for all the extra expenditure of energy involved.

Obviously, therefore, the extremists who hold that unemployment is inevitable under capitalism are quite out of court in the eyes of all practical and fair-minded men. Luckily, they (the extremists, not the practical and fair-minded) are but few, otherwise it would be necessary to take steps to combat their imbecile heresies.

A.J.M.G.

SUPPORT THE SOCIALIST PARTY

and benefit yourself by purchasing your goods at
The Stores, 127, York Rd., Battersea.

5 per cent given to purchasers and 5 per cent of profits given to Branches. Trading vouchers can be obtained of Secretary, Battersea Branch.

All Goods at Store Prices.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

CENTRAL OFFICE:

COMMUNIST CLUB,
107, CHARLOTTE ST., LONDON, W.
General Secretary C. LEHANE.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Business transacted every Saturday at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W. Membership in the Central Branch can be obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—Kate Hawkins, sec., 47, Wilmingdon Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 24, Wilmingdon Square, W.C.

EAST LONDON (Central).—G. Fletcher, Sec., 305, Wilmott Street, Bethnal Green, E. Branch meets every Friday at the Secretary's address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 35, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 40, Mablethorpe Rd., Fulham Cross, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m.

ISLINGTON.—J. McNicol, Secretary, 170, Isledon Rd., Finsbury Park, N. Branch meets every 2nd and 4th Tuesday of the month at 8.30 p.m. at the "Hope Coffee Tavern," 113, Fonthill Road, Finsbury Park, N.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—J. Kent, Secretary, 5, Rutland Road, Ilford. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Tuesdays in each month at 8.30 at secretary's address.

SOUTHWARK.—S. Eden, Secretary, 68, Penrose St., Walworth. Branch meets every Friday at 8.30 p.m. at the Café, Walworth.

TOOTING.—C. Goss, Secretary, 73, Balham Grove, Balham, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at 61, Glasford Street, Tooting.

TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.

WATFORD.—D. R. Newlands, Secretary, 5, Highfield Rd., Bushey, Herts. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m., 73, Harwoods Rd., Watford. Economic Class every Sunday at 3 p.m.

WEST HAM.—G. J. Hodson, Secretary, 'Kelmecott,' Sidney Road, Forest Gate, E. Branch meets every alternate Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at the address given.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

SYDNEY HALL

38, YORK ROAD,
BATTERSEA, S.W.

Sunday Night Lectures.

The following Lectures will be delivered at the above hall during January:

Jan. 8: T. A. JACKSON.

Subject: THE CLASS WAR.

Jan. 15: H. NEUMANN.

Subject: SOCIALISM and its Interpretation in Politics.

Jan. 22: J. CRUMP.

Subject: SOCIALISM: the Workers' Ideal.

Jan. 29: F. C. WATTS.

Subject: SOCIALISM, and the Survival of the Fittest.

TIME 7 p.m. ADMISSION FREE.
ALL WORKERS INVITED.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 6. Vol. I.]

LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

A LOOK ROUND.

LAST month we called attention to the action of J. Hunter Watts, member of the Executive Council of the S.D.F. in voting for a Liberal Candidate, and our comment has drawn forth a letter from him, which is dealt with elsewhere in this issue. This month it is our painful duty to refer to the sad case of Mr. J. J. Kidd, who is also a member of the S.D.F. Executive.

So that we may not be charged with telling a half truth we print Mr. Kidd's interesting and incriminating letter in full. It is addressed to Mr. Alfred Jermyn, Liberal Candidate for the South Ward at the recent municipal elections at King's Lynn.

Oct 20, 1904.

Dear Mr. Jermyn,—I am writing this to tell you that I sincerely hope you may be at the head of the poll on November 1st. Although I am now in another political camp, I remember with a great deal of gratitude the many sacrifices you have made for the cause of progress, how many times you have, almost single-handed, pioneered the Liberal cause in Lynn. I had the pleasure and privilege to work with you for some years and I always had some feelings of admiration for your work in those times, the up-hill task you often had. There is one sore place in my memory, and that is your opposition to the "housing" scheme; but there, I will not bring up grievances. I am only too glad that neither my desire, nor circumstances, have brought me out as a candidate in this ward this year, thereby risking you the loss of some few votes. I hope I may never be the means of defeating one who I feel deserves more at his fellows' hands than he has yet received (I mean, of course, appreciation). I hope all earnest and sincere Liberals like yourself will one day realise that the political arena of the future will be Labour v. Capitalism, the struggle between the possessors and the dispossessed and then you will throw unqualified energy in the workers' movements. If all those Liberals who realise this would cut themselves adrift from all that hampers this movement irrespective of party claims, there would not be so much division in the Progressive ranks as there is today.

I hope you will appreciate my good wishes and pardon my presumption, but I feel that you are entitled to both. I shall give my vote to you on the day of the poll from a sense of duty and pleasure.

You will, however, regard this as strictly private and confidential.—Yours faithfully,
(Signed) J. J. KIDD.

It is apparent from Mr. Kidd's desire that his letter should be regarded as "strictly private and confidential" that he saw the impossibility of reconciling his action with the policy to which he was pledged as a member of the S.D.F., and which, when appointed to the Executive of that body last year, he undertook to enforce.

Will it be believed that three weeks after Mr. Kidd wrote this letter, upon a casual vacancy being declared in the same ward, he appeared as a candidate in opposition to Mr. Jermyn. We quote from "The Lynn News and County Press," whose leading article contained the following comment:

"If Mr. Kidd had been consistent in his opposition to Mr. Jermyn, we should have put it down to his loyalty towards his comrades of the S.D.F., and, while regretting his course of procedure, should have felt bound to admire his allegiance to principle. But we are in a position to state that during the recent fight Mr. Kidd actually went out of his way to give support to Mr. Jermyn, and expressed himself as the last man to wish to prevent Mr. Jermyn's return to the Council! What do Mr. Kidd's comrades think of this? What do they think of a man who, but a week or two ago, was earnestly in favour of Mr. Jermyn when a mere Labour candidate was running, and expressed thorough approval of his municipal policy, but now turns round and opposes him tooth and nail? It is on our own initiative that we make these accusations against Mr. Kidd's fidelity as a public man; if the Socialists of the South Ward desire further information let them ask Mr. Kidd for a copy of the letter he wrote to Mr. Jermyn just prior to November 1st. We know, as a matter of fact, that Mr. Jermyn has written to Mr. Kidd, asking leave to publish this letter—a document which we are sure would absolutely destroy the Socialists' confidence in Mr. Kidd; but Mr. Kidd has seen Mr. Jermyn and personally begged the Progressive candidate not to publish it. Mr. Jermyn's hands are therefore tied, because the letter was marked 'private and confidential'; but if Mr. Jermyn cannot succeed in dragging it into the light of day, perhaps Mr. Kidd's deluded supporters may be more successful. In any case we think it well to give them a glimpse of their idol's clay feet!"

After this well-merited attack Mr. Kidd wrote a further letter to Mr. Jermyn, in which he said "I have prepared a leaflet for publication which will cause you pain and annoyance." Mr. Jermyn at once published all the correspondence, and it can well be imagined who suffered the "pain and annoyance."

Let us never forget that, as Liebnicht says, the class war is the basis of Socialism, and that those who do not accept this, however friendly they may be to us personally, are socially and politically our enemies, says "Justice." If the Executive members of the S.D.F. forget it, what can be expected of the rank and file?

There are very many of these social and political enemies whom probably we shall never convert, but we shall certainly gain their respect if we adhere steadfastly to principle and pursue a consistent policy which shall intelligently interpret our principles. On the other hand, actions like those of J. J. Kidd not only justify our opponents in despising the actors, but bring the Socialist Cause into disrepute and make a

laughing-stock of the members of any organisation permitting such conduct.

It is nearly five years since H. M. Hyndman wrote that the S.D.F. was "wholly destitute of political aptitude." Conduct such as Kidd's proves that it still is so. The least that can be said of it is that it is like the Peace of God.

To those who imagine that no contentment or decency can exist otherwise than in a state of capitalism-cum-Christianity, the following extract from a letter which appears in the "Mill Hill (Leeds) Chapel Record," written by Rev. C. Hargrove, from the Tutuila Island, Samoa, under date 28th October last, may not be altogether unpalatable reading:

"The decency of this half-naked people surprises me. I have been to and from among the villages and have never seen anything dirty or offensive on the part of man, woman or child. They seem possessed of an innate sense of propriety and cleanliness."

"They have no idea of saving or private ownership; if a man earns a few dollars his people come as soon as he is paid and help him to spend it. Food in especial is common property, and no native would think of refusing another a share of whatever he has. 'No better than a foreigner' is their contemptuous description of the man who tries to save. One consequence of this practical communism is that labour is scarce and dear. Why should a man work hard for a wage which will not profit him? So the Government has had to import labourers from less fortunate islands to do the toilsome work of excavating and road-making, which has been needed to make a harbour and wharf and coaling-station. They will no doubt learn our ways in time, and each look after his own family and accumulate a bit of money by hard work, and take to petty theft, now almost or altogether unknown among them. They will be more serviceable to the stranger. Will they be as happy or as good or even as Christian as they are now?"

According to the chief organ of "Tariff Reform," the "Daily Express," the German miners on strike demanded 4s. 6d. per day! Yet they tell us that wages are so high in protected countries!

A. PUBLIC Meeting was held at the Finsbury Town Hall last Tuesday evening, under the auspices of the Central Finsbury Liberal and Radical Association, to hear an address by John Burns. According to the bill the chairman was supported by W. C. Steadman, Alderman C. W. Bowerman, Alderman Isaac Mitchell, G. Dew, B. Cooper, H. Gosling, H. R. Taylor, C. Jesson, and other Labour "Leaders." How these people like to hang on to the tail of the capitalist politicians!

Mr. Andrew Johnston, J.P., C.C., says that as long as the nation pours a half a million down its throat every day of the year we shall have the unemployed problem. We are prepared to prove, in debate with this gentleman, that the unemployed problem does not exist because people drink, and that it could be solved even though more drink was consumed than at present.

J. Kay.

A PLAIN STATEMENT.

This article is intended to explain why it is that the Socialist Party of Great Britain has come into existence.

We ask you to read carefully what we have to say, because the matter concerns you intimately. You may not think so at present, but we are convinced that, if we could meet you in detail, dealing with your points of objection as they arise, we should be able to convince you that our side is your side, and that if you are concerned with the betterment of your present conditions and of the condition of your class, your proper position is with us, and your attitude the attitude which we adopt.

We cannot do this in a brief article. But we will gladly arrange to meet you and endeavour to make clear anything that is not clear.

Now what is the difference between the Socialist Party of Great Britain and other bodies claiming to be Socialist? But first of all, what is the view of the Socialist regarding the position of the working-class?

You know well enough that at best you only receive sufficient to supply you with the barest necessities of life. Only the very fortunate have any margin for extra comforts. At the best you are always dependent upon the employer for a chance to work so that you may live. You cannot even demand to work. At the present time great numbers are walking about absolutely unable to find a master to employ them. That number will increase. And when you have work you are never sure of its continuance. You have always the insecurity of it hanging over you.

That is the best view. At the worst, when you are worn and grey hairs show, when you give the slightest sign of age or physical weakening, your place is on the labour scrap-heap. Abject misery, appalling poverty, an outlook black as the mouth of hell.

This is no picture of the fancy. It is the bare fact. We are of the working-class. We know what we write. You know that we speak truly.

And yet labour is the source of all wealth. There are few to deny that today. Then why is it that the recompense of labour is miserable and inadequate at the best?

The Socialist claims to know. It is because the land and the factories and the railways—all the means that is by which necessary things are produced and distributed—are in the hands of comparatively few people. It doesn't matter for the moment how they got there. It is sufficient that they are there. It is the explanation, and the only explanation, of why the worker is cap in hand, a pitiable beggar. He has no property. He has no access to the means of life. He has nothing but his power to work. And he sells that for what he can get.

There are thousands of him available. All want to live. All must work to live. But to such perfection has machinery been developed that all the things for which there is any demand can be produced in an astonishingly short time. There are not sufficient vacancies for all the men available. There is not enough work to go round!

And so the men compete for what jobs there are. That is why the wages of the workers are on the average just sufficient to keep them in bare necessities. Competition for work prevents the wages rising.

The private ownership of the means of life then is the cause of the miserable condition of the workers. The remedy is, and can only be, the abolition of such private ownership and the substitution of ownership and control by the whole people.

That is a drastic change. Your Tory and Liberal politicians will tell you that the change can never be wrought.

They will also talk about the injustice of taking away from the people who own them, the land and machinery, etc. which they say are theirs. The injustice of taking away from them the power to live upon the labour of others! The wrongfulness of taking away from them for the benefit of the whole people the things they have taken from the whole people for their own individual benefit!

Pay no attention to the Liberals and Tories.

They want the basis of the present arrangement to remain as it is. They may under some circumstances agree to make some alteration that will affect some of the results of the arrangement. But it is the basis that is wrong.

Can the workers effect the change? We answer yes. Just so soon as they grasp the Socialist position; just so soon as they thoroughly understand the real cause of their misery and the only remedy, they can effect the change.

But not a moment before then. What does the understanding of the Socialist position involve? Please try to follow us closely here because it is just here that we part company with the other bodies claiming to be Socialist.

An understanding of the Socialist position involves a recognition of the fact that the interests of those who own and control the means of life (the capitalist class) are absolutely opposed to the interests of those who own nothing but their power to work (the working-class). The first are concerned to make a profit out of the labour of the second. The second are battling for the best conditions they can get. If the second are successful to any degree to that degree the first are losers. To the extent that the first are able to use their power to coin wealth out of the labour of the second, to that extent are the second the losers.

Is that clear?

Don't be put off the track by good capitalists. We are not concerned to deny that some members of the capitalist class are genuinely sorry that the condition of the working-class is so bad and would prefer it otherwise. That is not the point. The point is that as a class their interests are opposed absolutely to the interests of the class they exploit—the working-class—and under no circumstance whatever can that conflict of interest be avoided.

It does not matter whether the working-class are conscious of it or not. The conflict is inevitable and unceasing. The Socialist calls it the class-struggle.

Some of those who claim to be Socialists—members of the Independent Labour Party particularly—cannot see that this class-struggle exists and must exist. Which shows that they do not thoroughly understand the position. And those who do not thoroughly understand the position cannot be relied upon. They cannot instruct the workers in what they themselves do not understand. The blind make bad leaders of the blind although they are probably very sympathetic.

Now if we are agreed so far, (and we trust you will not hesitate to let us know if we are not), what is the first step the working-class must take to effect that change in the ownership and control of the means of life which is necessary to the material and permanent betterment of working-class conditions; upon what must their efforts be concentrated?

Upon the capture of the political machine. That is to say they must organise and direct their forces with the object of securing control of the legislative and administrative bodies (the House of Commons, County, Urban and Rural Councils, Boards of Guardians, etc.) Why?

Because these bodies are strongholds of the capitalist party. They form their most important line of attack and defence.

Through them the laws are made and administered that secure them in their position. Through them the armed forces of the nation are at their disposal to assist, among other things, in keeping the workers in subjection at those times when their conditions become more than usually intolerable.

The ignorance of the workers in the past has enabled the capitalists to possess themselves of the political machine. The workers all unwittingly have made the rod that is now applied to their backs. But what working-class ignorance has done working-class enlightenment can undo.

But the working-class must thoroughly understand what they are about. There must be no confusion as to what it all means. And that is why the Socialist Party of Great Britain is in the field. We are ourselves of the working-class. The lot of the workers—our own lot—cannot be improved materially or permanently until the workers themselves have understood their position, the reasons for it and the remedy, and have themselves struck the blow which shall free them from the domination of the capitalist.

We are anxious, therefore, that the workers shall know the whole truth, shall take no leap in the dark, make no move in ignorance. Because the capitalist is very wide awake and very quick to seize any advantage that will help him to retain his power. And so to us it is absolutely necessary that the workers shall see every step of the way clearly before they take it.

Which may mean a slow advance, but it will certainly mean a sure advance.

We know that if the workers follow the lead of men who have not recognised and understood the meaning of the existence of the class-struggle they will go wrong.

If they follow leaders who are prepared to make working-class confusion worse confounded by allying themselves with capitalist parties for the realisation of reforms that cannot by any chance solve the poverty problem, they will go wrong.

If they follow any except those who are at open and perpetual war with the capitalist class; who will make no compromise or arrangement, either temporarily or permanently, with them, because to do so would only confuse the issues in the minds of the workers, and by concentrating their attention upon matters of minor importance, divert them from the consideration of the real problem; who combat ignorance wherever it is found, even when it is found in a "Labour Leader"; who steadfastly pursue an unswerving path straight to the Socialist Republic, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left, and bearing their flag aloft to be seen of all men: if the workers follow any but these they will go wrong.

The workers' ignorance is in the way of their advance. They want enlightenment. And to us it seems that the way to enlighten them is not to present a confused issue. They want a plain issue, clear cut, boldly defined.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain presents the plain issue. They say the ownership by a few people of the means of life is the cause of working-class misery. They say the only remedy lies in the common ownership and control (ownership and control by the whole people) of these means of life. Which is Socialism.

They say that while the basis of Society remains as at present, that is while Society is based upon the private ownership of the means of life, the worker's position must always remain the same in its principle features; that municipal enterprise affects him in the mass, not at all; that political reforms or what not leave him always the exploited, always the under dog.

They point out that these reforms are never achieved except at great effort; that they are never achieved at all (except they benefit some section of the capitalist class) unless and until the workers have set on foot such a determined agitation that their demands cannot with safety be longer disregarded, as a glance at industrial history will show.

They point out that, notwithstanding the expenditure of great effort on the part of the workers in the past, one third of the population of the United Kingdom (about 13 millions) are either on or below the poverty line, despite the fact that the wealth of the country, all produced by labour, has increased enormously; that, in brief, relative to the wealth of the country, the position of the working-class is not only no better than it ever was, but as a matter of fact is worse.

They say that this result is due to the ignorance of the workers, who, because they have not understood their position as a class, have, under the leadership of men equally ignorant, concentrated their efforts upon securing some alteration in what are really effects of the private ownership of the means of life, and have not gone to the root of the matter at all.

They say finally that the results must always be the same until the workers have fully realised where their real interests lie (have become class-conscious), and have organised their forces specifically for the complete overthrow of the present system of production and the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth; have refused to longer waste their energies upon securing reforms, and have determined to substitute ownership and control of the means of life by the whole people for the present private or individual ownership and control.

That is the plain issue that The Socialist Party of Great Britain presents. Is it clear? Do you see your way?

J. HUNTER WATTS
EXPLAINS HIS
Vote for Masterman.

The General Secretary of The Socialist Party of Great Britain has received the following communication:

94 Grove Park, Denmark Hill,
15th Jan'y 1905.

Dear Comrade,—A lie that is half a truth is the worst lie of all" and it is a half truth to which THE SOCIALIST STANDARD gives currency this month when it says that I voted for a Liberal candidate for the constituency in which I reside and advised other members of the S.D.F. to do the same. A Jameson raider offered himself for election, and as I shall never either forget or forgive any instrument of the iniquity which robbed another of the little peoples of its national freedom I did my best to thwart the ambition of Rutherford Harris. As there is no way of voting against a man other than voting for his opponent I "supported" Masterman, though I know no more of the man than I know of the one who is said to reside in the moon. I shall repeat the offence at the next election even if the raider's opponent is a circus clown.

Yours fraternally,
(Signed) J. HUNTER WATTS.

Comrade C. Lehane,
Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, W.C.

The note to which Mr. J. Hunter Watts referred was as follows:

"In our last issue we dealt with the S.D.F., I.L.P., and L.R.C. members being induced to support the Liberal faction of the Capitalist Party at "Free Trade" meetings, and we notice that H. Kirby deals with the same matter in "Justice." He describes Mr. Masterman, the Liberal Candidate for North West Ham, as "an adept at trailing Liberal red herrings before the workers' noses." But we would remind Mr. Kirby that when Masterman contested Dulwich, one of the best known members of the S.D.F., J. Hunter Watts, voted for him and urged other Social-Democrats to do so likewise. Now, if Masterman was advanced enough for such a leading revolutionary Social-Democrat as Hunter Watts, surely smaller fry should follow such a good example? Perhaps one of these days the S.D.F. will endeavour to pursue a consistent policy, but we are afraid it will then be too late for them to regain the public confidence."

We now print a letter written by Mr. J. Hunter Watts to the then Secretary of the Peckham Branch S.D.F. during the election referred to.

94 Grove Park, Denmark Hill,
13th December, 1903.

Dear Comrade,—Till after Christmas I have so many business claims on my attention (last Wednesday I was obliged to travel to Manchester and shall probably have to return this week) would you kindly intimate to the members of the Elocution Class that we will start work the first Wednesday in January. If convenient to them I would rather hold the class here because all my books etc. will be ready to hand but I leave it to their choice and I will come to the Branch Room if they prefer that rendez-vous.

Though it goes very much against the grain to vote for a Liberal, it seems to me a duty to do one's level best to prevent a Jameson Raider being sent to Parliament as our Parliamentary Representative so I intend to vote for Masterman on Tuesday. Would you kindly ask the members of our Branch to consider tomorrow night whether as individuals they can adopt the same policy though collectively it might be unwise to support Masterman. On Harris's head rests some of the blood of the peasant farmers slain in defence of their national independence.

We cannot forget this!
Yours fraternally,
J. HUNTER WATTS.
The Secy. Peckham Branch S.D.F.

We have no desire to misrepresent anyone, and we publish the whole of the correspondence in order that our readers may see that there is no foundation for Mr. Hunter Watts' suggestion

(or "half truth") that we were not strictly accurate in our statement that he "voted for Masterman and urged other Social-Democrats to go and do likewise." As a member of the S.D.F. Mr. Hunter Watts is supposed to believe that there is no difference between the various sections of the capitalist politicians, but by exhibiting a preference for one capitalist candidate (about whom he claims to know no more than about the man in the moon, but who, according to another S.D.F. member, is "an adept at trailing Liberal red herrings before the workers' noses") against another whom he knows as an open enemy of the people, he shows that he recognises a difference, and that there are occasions when he thinks that the workers should vote for their class-enemies.

If Masterman was worthy of S.D.F. votes in Dulwich he is equally so in North West Ham. Here Ernest Gray, Conservative member and candidate, has supported Rutherford Harris and his friends fearlessly and openly, from the Jameson Raid to the Chinese Labour Ordinance. If individuals are to be singled out then "some of the blood of the peasant farmers" rests upon Ernest Gray's head and he should be kept out of the House of Commons. The S.D.F. should vote against him by voting for Masterman. The blood of the murdered Featherstone miners is upon the head of Mr. Asquith, and the S.D.F. should try to keep him out of the House of Commons by voting for his Tory opponent. But Masterman as a member of the Liberal faction must support his leaders, of whom Mr. Asquith is one. And candidates who support the person responsible for that cruel and cold-blooded butchery should be kept out of the House of Commons, therefore the S.D.F. should vote against Masterman.

Mr. Hunter Watts says that he will repeat the offence at the next election even if the raider's opponent is a circus clown. Supposing Mr. Asquith is the opponent, Mr. Hunter Watts will vote for him and show that he considers the South African war more important than the class war here at home.

If particular incidents connected with the capitalist attitude towards the people are to be taken into consideration and capitalist candidates voted for or against because of them, where will it lead?

Mr. Hunter Watts is apparently aware that there is neither wisdom nor logic in his attitude because he expresses the opinion that it would not be wise for the S.D.F. to do collectively that which headvisees members to do individually. But electoral action which the Body cannot take wisely and logically does not become wise or logical when taken by individual members.

The position is as illogical and contradictory as is that of the S.D.F. towards the L.R.C. Although the Body withdrew because it "might be committed to the support of candidates whom, by its rules, it was bound to oppose; while it could not honestly accept aid for its own candidates unless it supported those favoured by the majority of the delegates" it yet allows its members all over the country to act as delegates to the L.R.C., and to do precisely that which the S.D.F. says it cannot do.

Mr. Hunter Watts, like many others, has allowed his emotions to get the better of his convictions. He may be unable to forget or forgive any instrument of the iniquity referred to, but neither the defeat of Harris nor the return of Masterman would restore freedom to the Boers any more than the defeat of Asquith would bring back to life the murdered miners. The instruments of both iniquities were the capitalist class, acting in the interests of their class and against the interests of the common people, here and abroad. Capitalist politicians cannot be considered individually, but only as "all the rest, Tories, Unionists, Whigs, Liberals and Radicals who form a part of that hateful army of parasites which is permanently quartered on you and your children" (see S.D.F. Manifesto, General Election, 1895). Speaking at Canning Town last month Mr. D. Irving, also a member of the S.D.F. Executive, declared that "it does not matter a brass farthing whether Balfour or Campbell Bannerman reign at Westminster." We agree. Let us be able to assert that neither shall do so by the votes of Socialists.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

To facilitate the transaction of the business of the Editorial and Management Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to conduct its official Organ, members of the Party and other readers are particularly requested to address all literary communications to the *Editorial Committee*, 3, Arvon Road, Highbury, N., and all business correspondence, including Subscriptions and Advertisements, to A. Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.

(Signed) C. LEHANE, Secretary,
Editorial and Management Committee.

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months	£ s. d.
...	0 1 6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion	£ s. d.
...	0 2 0
Quarter Column do.	0 5 6
Half Column do.	0 10 0
One Column do.	1 0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1905.

RUSSIA.

REVOLUTION AND AFTER.

THE entry of Russia into the stage of machine production and international commercial inter-communication made it essential that there should be a limitation of the autocracy which had hitherto dominated that empire. To engage in competition for foreign and neutral markets with other commercial countries rendered it necessary that the press should be removed from the censorship of the ruling class, so that the widest publicity should be given to matters concerning commerce; that education should become more general, so that the worker might become a more efficient machine minder; that freedom of contract should be exhibited in all trade relations between merchants and manufacturers, so as to secure equality of competition.

With an autocracy interfering in all matters, private or public, these freedoms desired by the middle-class could not be secured, so that it was but a question of time how soon the growing middle-class would seek to secure political power for itself. This could only be obtained by the establishment of a constitutional government, either of the republican or of the monarchical form.

Against this desire the autocracy exercised all its powers. The knout, the mines, Siberia—these were some of the powers they used, and used mercilessly. As a result the agitation of the middle-class was driven below the surface. Secret societies, Nihilist societies were but the expression of the objects of the middle-class. True! they sometimes had the support of working men, but it was nevertheless a middle-class movement. The members were mainly from the commercial class, the professions, the students at the universities. These formed the centre of the movement. Any support they received from the landed aristocracy, or from the uneducated working masses, was of minor import.

At the same time that this movement was going on, taxation in Russia was excessive. The autocracy, knowing that its only hope for the maintenance of its stability was imperial aggrandisement, carried on wars against the weak and incoherent races of Asia, built railways at immense cost for the furtherance of those warlike designs. The ruling class, financially corrupt, and financially bankrupt, carrying

on their schemes with borrowed money, found it necessary to levy heavy taxes to pay such portion of the interest of such borrowed money as was not itself paid with the money borrowed.

The result was great distress among many of the trading sections of the community, and among many of the members of the agricultural communes. The Mir, instead of being a commune carried on for the benefit of its members, was maintained as a machine for facilitating the collecting of taxes.

The distress was greatly augmented by the war with Japan, and recently hardly a week has passed without hearing of men mutilating themselves to prevent their being taken as soldiers, of wholesale emigration from Russia, of murders of governors of towns and provinces.

The working-class, too,—that class which has to carry on the battles of its masters—began to manifest signs of unrest. Strikes have followed strike in all parts of Russia. The desires expressed have been for economic and political reform on the part of the workers, for political reform on the part of the middle-class.

In order to gain those desires a large number of the discontented wished to make a peaceable demonstration before the Winter Palace at St. Petersburg. These were no revolutionists! they did not belong to Socialist Societies; nor did they believe in Socialist principles! They were but unlettered working men with middle-class leaders, who believed that the Czar—the father of his people—had but to learn of their wrongs to redress them.

Poor misguided workers! Foolish you, to believe that you could gain redress except from among yourselves. A ruling class whose interests are opposed unto yours will do nothing for you. You must emancipate yourselves.

This lesson, taught the workers in many countries, had yet to be learnt by the Russian working-class. They had not sufficiently learnt that in other countries the military was a weapon used to quell strikes. Men and women shot down in Milan and Turin during the grain riots, when Leiter tried to corner the world's supply of wheat; men struck down in the recent general strike in Italy; innocent men shot down in Featherstone; gunboats sent to Hull during the dock strike, and to Grimsby, and soldiers to Penrhyn during the strike there; martial law declared in Colorado; men tortured to death in the Monjuich Prison at Barcelona; Pinkertons used to shoot down the strikers at the steel works of Carnegie at Homestead; strikers bludgeoned in the streets of Rosario. Everywhere the same civilised methods have been used, and will be used, when the workers strive to endanger the stability of commercial society by securing a greater quantity of the products of their own labour for their own consumption.

Now this lesson is being taught in autocratic Russia, as it has been taught in Monarchical England and Republican France. Hundreds of men, women, and children have been butchered in the streets of St. Petersburg. In other centres, too, a like answer has been given to the demands of the workers. The class struggle manifests itself clearly, and what will be the result in Russia? We fear that the result will be but the victory of the middle-class. The Constitutionalists in Russia in 1905 will, like the Liberals in England in 1831, and the French middle-class in 1789, 1830, and 1848, use the working-class for their own ends, and then throw them over. The Russian worker is, we fear, too illiterate to understand clearly his own class interest, and will, therefore, need years of education before he takes his place with the vanguard of the international working-

class revolution.

We think the result will be the disruption of the Russian empire into middle-class republics. Although to-day the revolutionaries in Finland will join with those in Poland, or Lithuania, and in the other Russian provinces in the same way as middle-class and working-class will combine in opposition to the ruling class, yet no sooner will they have achieved their victory, and desire to carry on the constructive work of government than all the disharmony of jarring interests will be manifested. Then, too, one section of the vast empire will be found more advanced than another, and agreement will be obtained only by separation.

Be this as it may, it is for the Russian Socialist, as for the Socialist everywhere, to recognise that it is for him to carry on his propaganda. He must use every phase of the movement for the furtherance of his ideal, always remembering that neither the rule of the Zemstvo, nor of any other middle-class government, will mean emancipation for him from his economic bondage. His hope must be in propagating his principles, in making capital out of every mistake of his enemies, in organising the workers to seize hold of the reins of government, in teaching them how best to use that government when they have it in their possession.

Whether this should be now, or should be later, they should clearly recognise that the best wishes of the international Socialist movement is with them, for any victory of the Socialist movement in Russia will be a victory for it everywhere, and would lend fresh hopes, and give a fresh incentive to their comrades throughout the world. The interests of the workers of all countries are the same—the establishment of the Socialist Republic.

A BRITISH TRUST GETS BIGGER.

THE Distillers' Company, Edinburgh, have intimated that they have concluded an agreement with the United Distillers' (Limited), of Belfast, whereby one-half of their shares of the Irish company will pass to the Distillers' Company, and make a further issue of capital to meet the purchase price. The United Distillers (Limited) belongs to three of the largest grain distillers in Ireland, and the purchase has been made by the Scottish company to complete their control of the production of raw grain whisky. The Distillers' Company practically control the world's markets now for this class of whisky, which is chiefly used by blenders. The existing capital of the Distillers' Company is £1,920,000, and the new capital will make it £2,100,000.

THE Baking of bread by electricity should find considerable favour, not only on account of its economy and cleanliness, but because it would afford a rational means of utilising the electric power of a town at a time when it would not be required for lighting purposes—between midnight and midday. Should the process become general, it would be possible to abolish nightwork for bakers.—"Commercial Intelligence."

INVERARY CASTLE, and the extensive shootings attached, have been sublet by Mr. A. F. B. Cresswell, with the consent of the Duke of Argyll, to Mr. E. D. Jordan, of Boston, an American millionaire, who comes into occupation this summer. Thus the aristocrat succumbs to the power of the almighty dollar, and the plutocrat reigns in his stead.

Last Monday it was announced from Middlesbrough that there will be a reduction of 3d. per ton on the puddling, and 2½ per cent. on other wages in the North of England iron and steel trades during the months of February and March.

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

PARTY NOTES.

DURING February there will be two meetings of the Executive Committee, viz., Saturday 4th, at 3 p.m., and Tuesday 21st, at 7 p.m. The attendance of Party members to witness the proceedings of the Executive has been good so far, but there is accommodation for more. In no better way can members become conversant with the working of the organisation than by assisting at these meetings.

The following letter has been received from Comrade Phillips:

"17th January, 1905.
"Dear Comrade,—Herewith I have pleasure in enclosing £5, donation to the funds of the Socialist Party of Great Britain. I had originally intended to contribute this sum to the S.D.F. War Chest, but fate in the shape of Burnley intervened.

"Yours fraternally,
"H. C. PHILLIPS."

If there are others who would like to invest their spare cash in the advancement of the Revolution, let them emulate the example of our Comrade Phillips. And remember that a thousand farthings spent in spreading the principles of revolutionary Socialism are worth more than a thousand pounds given to any reform party.

The first Quarterly Delegate Meeting was held on Saturday, 21st January, at the Communist Club. F. C. Watts was unanimously elected Chairman, and the report of the Credentials Committee showed there were twenty delegates present, representing eleven Branches, as follows:—Battersea: H. T. Davey, A. Jones, Edmonton: R. Kenny, A. Pearson. Fulham: E. J. B. Allen. Islington: W. L. Augur, J. McNicol. Paddington: F. G. Thompson, F. C. Watts. Peckham: W. G. Killick, H. Martin. Tooting: F. Reid. Tottenham: L. Boyne, J. W. Robertson. Watford: G. T. H. King, D. R. Newlands. West Ham: G. C. H. Carter, W. Gifford. Wood Green: R. H. Kent, H. Crump.

The business of the meeting was "to receive the Quarterly Report of the Executive Committee, and to deal with same." The Executive report showed that two new Branches had been formed, the Romford Division and the Tottenham Branch, bringing the number of Branches on the list up to sixteen. With the exception of Southwark, all were in a state of activity, but the Clerkenwell and East London Branches required some strengthening.

The Edmonton Branch topped the list as regards increase of membership. This result was due to the vigorous propaganda conducted by the local members, and it was to the efforts of the Edmonton comrades that the establishment of the Tottenham Branch was mainly attributable.

The Treasurer's statement indicated that the Party finances were in a sound condition. Our members, like the rest of the working-class, have been affected by the extraordinary wave of unemployment passing over the country, and the natural result has been that our revenue from the sale of dues stamps has fallen considerably, the actual decrease as compared with the previous quarter being 50 per cent.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD has been published regularly, its circulation being well maintained during the winter, but to put the Party Organ on a self-supporting basis a considerably larger circulation would be needed. When the propaganda season opened, however, a greater sale would be achieved, and the regular holding of meetings, together with a thoroughly organised distribution, would, the Executive hoped, necessitate the printing of twice the present quantity.

Hitherto our organising efforts had been devoted mainly to the metropolis, but this year new ground should be broken, and the Party brought to the knowledge of the workers in various provincial centres. The lack of the necessary funds was a great obstacle in this as well as in many other directions, but the Executive were considering the problem of removing that barrier in the way of the growth of the Party.

Generally, considering that we were in the winter months when propaganda is necessarily restricted, and in view of the fact that the Party Organ had been maintained, bearing also in mind that the position of The Socialist Party of Great Britain as a factor in national and international politics had steadily and materially advanced since its inception, the Executive believed they were justified in stating that a successful quarter's work had been accomplished.

This was, apparently, the view of the delegates also, for having discussed the report, point by point, they adopted it by 17 votes to 0.

C. LEHANE.

Correspondence

SIR,—I write for information upon three points which perhaps you will think it worth while to deal with, or which you may not be averse to having discussed, through your columns. I believe my difficulties are shared by many others who, like myself, are trying to feel their way to a safe—because sound—position. I will, with your permission, set out the points as briefly as may be.

I.—THE BOGEY OF THE TAXES.

On this matter I have read with interest the article published over the name of J. Fitzgerald, but confess I cannot yet follow the argument as to the workers being unaffected by taxation.

I can see that competitive conditions cause wages to revolve around the cost of subsistence of the labourer, but I must concede that, in the main, the present standard of comfort of the labourer is above the bare subsistence level. That is to say that, in perhaps the majority of cases, there is a margin—small enough, it may be, but still a margin—between what the labourer receives in wages and the amount necessary to defray his bare cost of living; between what he *does* live on and what he *could* live on.

Granting this, I do not clearly see why an increase in the cost of living resulting from taxation should not affect the labourer to his detriment. Suppose a necessity of life—say bread—to cost sixpence per loaf, and suppose a tax equal to one penny per loaf is put upon grain. The labourer must have bread and he must now pay sevenpence where formerly sixpence served. Would not that increase mean a reduction in his reserve or margin; a hardening of his conditions of life? And does not that mean that he is affected by taxation?

The same argument would apply in the case of an increase in the cost of a luxury—say tobacco or tea. The labourer would have to content himself with less of either, or both. Anyhow he would suffer.

Of course, a small increase in taxation would not necessarily imply a rise in price. But in the case of increases that do, is it not fair to conclude that the workers' position would be so much the worse? Certainly it seems to me that, although the tendency may be for wages to rise in the proportion of the increase in price, the tendency would not be apparent immediately—would not perhaps manifest itself at all—and in the interval between the rise and the time when the wages would balance the extra expenditure, the worker would be worse off. Would that be the case or not? If so, are the workers affected by taxes or not? And if not why not?

II.—IS THE SOCIALIST PROPAGANDIST NECESSARY?

This is my second difficulty. I have heard it contended that the ignorance and apathy of

the workers of this country are due to the effect of adverse economic conditions which militate against any desire for study they may have started out with, and which too often crush out the aptitude for learning completely. Ignorance and apathy, it is said, are but the reflex of material conditions. The remedy is the alteration of those conditions.

On the other hand, it is urged that no material improvement is possible in the present position of the worker unless the worker himself awakes to an understanding of his position and the reasons for it, and has taken over the means of production, &c., in his own interests. Hence the Socialist propagandist.

Here is the rub. The intelligence of the worker can only expand as a result of the alteration of his present conditions. Yet the alteration of the conditions is dependent upon the expansion of the working-class intelligence. The latter must precede the former, yet the former must precede the latter!

It occurs to me, of course, that the present form of production and distribution must, by the laws of its development, change. But will that alteration tend to produce enlightenment and dispel apathy in the worker? At present the effect seems to be the other way about. If, however, this is not so, if the intellectual development of the worker keeps even pace with his economic development, what is the use exactly of the Socialist propagandist?

III.—ON MUNICIPAL ENTERPRISE.

My last difficulty has to do with municipalism. I cannot see that the municipalisation of any public service can be other than a gain to the people.

It has been stated that the small capitalist class favour such enterprises because they (the enterprises) conserve their (the small capitalists') interests. I do not follow that. Municipal stock may provide the small capitalists with safe investments, but only, it seems to me, while the loan remains unpaid. When the cost of the enterprise has been defrayed, that concern becomes public property—the property of the whole people. The capitalist has lost his gilded security.

Why cannot municipalism be regarded as a step—and a considerable step—towards the goal of the Co-operative Commonwealth? Why should it not indeed be regarded as an expression of the necessary and inevitable development of a sense of citizenship in the worker?

In conclusion, Sir, I ask that you will not think these questions are put idly, or with any other than a desire for information. The questions are knotty ones to me. I know they are knotty to many others also. To deal with them would, I feel convinced, be good propaganda work. To have a "Doubts and Difficulties" column would be good business, and most helpful to little thinkers stumbling in the dark. I submit the notion to your kind consideration, and am, Sir, yours, &c.,

"IGNORAMUS."

[We shall be pleased to have the comments of our readers upon the points raised in our correspondent's letter, and should any of our readers have any "Doubts or Difficulties" on any question bearing, however distantly, upon Socialism, we shall endeavour to remove them. If a sufficient number of questions are asked we shall be very pleased to devote the necessary space to their answer.—ED. COMMITTEE.]

"For our party, and for our party tactics, there is but one valid basis: the basis of the class-struggle, out of which the Socialist Party has sprung up, and out of which alone it can draw the necessary strength to bid defiance to every storm, and to all its enemies. . . . We may not do as other parties, because we are not like the others. We are—and this cannot be too often repeated—separated from all other parties by an insurmountable barrier, a barrier that any individual can easily surmount; but once on the other side of it, and he is no Socialist. . . . Just in this fact lies our strength, that we are not like the others, but that we are their deadly enemy, who have sworn to storm the Bastille of Capitalism, whose defenders all those others are. Therefore we are only strong when we are alone."

LEHANE.

THE SOCIAL PROBLEM, AND ITS SOLUTION.

II.—SOLUTION.

The solution of the social problem is to be found in the problem itself, such as economic phenomena present it, and such as I have just given in a short exposition. The greatest socio-economic evil of to-day consists in the ever more complete divorce of the two factors in production, labour and property or capital, and consequently the remedy can be found only in their unification.

Under what form ought this unification to be effected?

It cannot be carried out by making the individual worker proprietor of his tool since this would exclude production on a large scale, and the system of labour having become collective consequent upon the introduction of steam and electricity, there can be but collective ownership to go hand in hand with collective labour.

Outside a Count de Mun, hypnotised by the arts and crafts of the middle ages and counting on a miracle for their re-establishment, there are only the anarchists, dreaming of natural rights and an ideal State of nature, who would retrogressively push their Utopia to such an extent as to establish a system of sharing out, of dismemberment and individualisation of modern machinery.

The engine to the driver,
And the dome to the builder,
as they sing in what is for them their "Marseillaise."

The only possible form, I repeat, is that which is imposed by the modern conditions of production and exchange, not even communal or guild, but social. The mines whose dark caverns are hollowed out beneath the crust of many counties, the railways that stretch their iron tentacles over entire continents, commercial establishments like the Louvre and Bon Marché disposing of the lives of thousands of workers, do not, not one of them, lend themselves to communalisation, no more than the other machinery of production, distribution, or transport. Consequent upon the transmission of force by means of electricity, the waterfalls to-day and the tides tomorrow can be converted into motive powers. With this fact in mind, how is it possible to consider seriously, for one moment, the notion of the monopolisation—I had nearly said confiscation—of these natural powers, now become the condition of all industry, by some localities to the detriment of others?

The guild form is likewise brought into collision with other impossibilities of a similar nature. In fact, both forms, by the competition which would be kept up between the various productive groups, here guild, there communal, would bring in their train the same murderous anarchy as exists to-day under capitalist society.

It is only collectively that the workers, comprising the entire nation, can and ought to possess the means of wealth (mines, railways, canals, factories, etc.) socially operated. Capitalist evolution itself supplies the necessary elements, material and intellectual, of this APPROPRIATION and of this PRODUCTION BY AND FOR SOCIETY now become a vast co-operative commonwealth.

MATERIAL ELEMENTS. The concentration of capital that is effected every day in the spheres of industry, commerce, and agriculture—the great manufacturing just as the no less great commerce and agriculture of to-day being impelled to swallow up the middle capitalists in the same way as the smaller ones have been already swallowed. From 1870 to 1880, when in the United States the number of spindles increased from 7,131,818 to 10,678,526 and the number of spinners from 157,310 to 227,156 with an increased value of from 562,825,164 francs to 831,127,472 francs, the cotton manufacturing fell from 959 to 751. It is the function of finance, by continually absorbing the surplus incomes, to hurry on this accumulation under the pretext of democratising capital.

INTELLECTUAL ELEMENTS: The concentration of all physical and mental activities in the non-possessing class or proletariat from the fireman and greaser of the wheels to the

scientist such as Claude Bernard, including chemist, engineer, manager, etc. The organisation of labour: the entire army of labour, officers and men, comprising all outside the capitalist class, is already encompassed in complete order on the patrimony of mankind, which alone is to be exploited—in the technical sense of the word—and it is now only a question of the complete restitution to society by the very same process which has served for its dispossession, namely: by EXPROPRIATION.

It is well to understand that we Socialists have no more invented the classes and their destructive class-war than we have invented the process of expropriation, which is the law of all human progress.

It was by the expropriation of the artisan from his tool at first, from his technical skill after, then from his domestic hearth, despoiled of wife and child, that private or capitalist property was established, to say nothing about the expropriation of the product of his toil which is accomplished daily by the operation of the law of wages. The expropriators will themselves in their turn be expropriated—it is as Gambetta would say, "imminent justice"—and they will all the more easily be expropriated under the company and share-holding system of to-day, they having become so completely estranged from all direct interference in production that their total severance might take place tomorrow without a perceptible check to industry.

This economic expropriation—which would allow to the expropriated full participation in the benefits accruing from social appropriation—must be preceded by a political expropriation, the establishment of the Socialist Republic being only realisable by a proletarian master of the State and acting in conformity with the law, since it itself will be and make the law.

It now only remains for me to point out the principle consequences which will result from this transformation of capitalist property into social property.

(1) There will be an end to all class distinction and consequently an end to the class-war. The workers are for the future their own capitalists, or to put it better, all the members of society are at once and with equal title co-propriators and co-producers. The State, in the oppressive sense of the word, will cease to exist, it being nothing more than a means of maintaining artificially, by force, order that a system of society, founded on the antagonism of interests would naturally give birth to. The government of men gives place to the administration of things. It is the reign of social peace, daughter of universal harmony.

(2) Commercial production of exchange-values with an end to realising profit will disappear, and be replaced by the co-operative production of use-values for consumption with a view to satisfying social wants. In place of robbing and exploiting one another, we will all help one another. *Homo domini Deus*, "Man is a god to man."

(3) Liberty, which until now has been but a word for the great majority of mankind, is henceforth a great and living reality, this liberty of which Socialism, according to our enemies, was to have been the tomb, will, on the contrary, blossom forth into the fullest perfection when reared in the uncontaminated atmosphere of the Socialist State. Liberty provides the means of accomplishing our will and therefore of satisfying our wants. These means will from now forward exist for all, multiplied by social labour, which, in point of productivity, stands in the same relation to modern capitalist industry as this latter does to small primitive industry. At the same time the effort to be made by each member of the community will be reduced to a minimum.

The socially necessary labour-time to be furnished by each capable member of the Socialist State will likewise be reduced:

(a) By the suppression of slack seasons, which are the rule to-day in so many trades during periods of from three to six months per year, as well as stoppages which doom to enforced idleness hundreds of thousands of workers, men and women, giving them over to the bitter pangs of starvation. These slack seasons and stoppages are the result, as Prof. Durkheim of Bordeaux very well puts it, of "the too great diffusion of the economic functions

which under Socialism will be transferred to the organised community."

(b) By the disappearance of the parasitical class, and not only of that alone but also of the sub-parasites who live on this class. In France there are more than two million persons of both sexes employed in domestic pursuits, without counting the numbers of prostitutes and parsons, police, magistrates, and soldiers.

(c) By the employment in work of a socially necessary character of all the human and mechanical forces now used in works of a destructive nature (cannon, guns, torpedoes, etc.) or socially useless (in superfluous display, or even of simple journeyings of capital from the pocket of Peter into that of Paul).

(d) By the utilisation of all the energy at present wasted, lost, or reduced to nothing in the midst of unbridled competition.

(e) By perfecting, "automatising," the machine which each one will be interested in developing as far as he can, since it will be so much the more leisure or well-being realised both for himself and the community in general.

Even to-day when no one of these conditions is either fulfilled or capable of being so, an English statistician, quoted by Domela Nieuwenhuis in his pamphlet on the First of May, has calculated that with the machine at its actual stage of development and taking into consideration the point we have reached in technical skill, one hour and twenty minutes of daily labour would suffice to provide for the material wants of all.

One more fruit of Socialist society and I have done: that is the end of religious or super-natural ideas current amongst men. The religious ideas, far from vanishing before the forward development of modern science, has taken a new flight. Thus it is that in the age which has seen the prolific genius of Lavoisier, Laplace, Darwin, and Edison, we have witnessed the birth of new religions. Why? Because other and still more complex phenomena have arisen in the place of natural phenomena already explained and controlled once and for all by man. The phenomena of which I speak belong to the economic order which in the individualist atmosphere of to-day escape from man's control and dominate him. God, chased out by one door, the door of nature, has re-entered by another, the social door. Therefore, as long as the productive forces which crush us individually will not have been mastered in the only way that they can be: by bringing them within the administration of society, man, a prey to misery, the plaything of chance, will bow low before the "unknown"—and will defy it.

It is only when the economic elements have been tamed as have been the natural elements, when society has become a providence for each one of its members, then and then alone will men cease to search for a providence beyond the skies, because then—contrary to the Christian legend of God becoming man—man will have become God.

Translated from the French of JULIUS GUESDE by P.J.T.

SUPPORT THE SOCIALIST PARTY

and benefit yourself by purchasing your goods at
The Stores, 127, York Rd., Battersea.

5 per cent given to purchasers and 5 per cent of profits given to Branches. Trading vouchers can be obtained of Secretary, Battersea Branch.

All Goods at Store Prices.

**The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
BATTERSEA BRANCH.**

A Grand Bazaar

Will be held at
SYDNEY HALL,
York Road, Battersea.

+ DURING EASTER. +

Full particulars later.

Physical Deterioration and Education.

It is frequently asserted by patrons of monopoly that the educating of the masses has been a dismal failure. The snob-employer says it resents fully when dismissing some audacious demand for wage increase, the patrician superciliously when some hireling makes him aware of the rights of men. The cleric contemplating his empty conventicle likewise laments the disastrous results of education. Each and all ascribe the lamentable condition of revolt to the dangerousness of a little learning. Viewed with capitalist eyes, if Education evokes class-consciousness it is indeed anathema, but to the Socialist the murmur of the master is a message of hope.

Is, or is not, compulsory education a waste of public funds?

Under existing conditions a vast amount of expenditure receives no ultimate return whatever. Statistics of five years back proved that 75% of the lowest class who had passed through all the standards of school had great difficulty to write legibly and read unobtrusively when the age of thirty was attained. Only this last week in discussion with an enthusiast on education who has much practical experience in slum schools and is quite anti-socialist, the following valuable admission was made: "Nothing can be done to obtain happier results unless the surroundings of the pupils are materially altered."

This current year in one of the poorer schools an inspector contrasted the work done by children of eleven with the studies easily understood by his young daughter of nine. The elder offspring of the picker-up of a precarious, hand-to-mouth existence—lagged far behind the junior whose childhood was unharassed by trade fluctuations. If it be true that "Where Care lodges, Sleep will not lie" verily it is daily proven that study and worry have no dealings one with another. How is it conceivable that the horrors of the home can be superseded by the joys of knowledge? For instance, our little ones come to morning session mainly breakfastless, certainly lacking a nourishing meal after a night of unrefreshing repose: children and adults alike occupy one bed in the vitiated atmosphere of the one room constituting their "home" situated in some airless slum—Short's Gardens, Lamb's Conduit Passage, Betterton Street, alleys in the New Cut and Canning Town. One child in the Third Standard three weeks ago awoke to find her mother dead by her side. Such shocks as these are not conducive to alertness of apprehension or retention of facts.

Again, compare the average age of scholars in higher grade and very poor schools. It is two years behind in the latter case; and then, too, the middle-class school displays no such divisions as are found in the less favoured one. Here the pupils are classified thus—An intelligent majority, who, by dint of incessant drudgery will be capable of passing up one standard every twelve months, then the obviously dull, who will be tutored in same class two or more years, sometimes when the age-limit of fourteen is reached the child is still in the Second Standard,—thirdly, those most pathetic specimens, pupils passed on from our defective centres. Very few people have any idea of the vast expense of these little citizens to the nation!

Although the Code of Instruction is supposed to be compiled for all schools under Government there is a significant clause in it to the effect that all regulations shall be enforced "as far as circumstances will permit." After arduous attempts to adopt the full curriculum the exemption has over and over again had to be claimed, owing to the total inability of the learners to grasp more than the merest rudiments. Inspectors will discourage the ambitions of a freshly installed head-teacher who places before them for their approval a most comprehensive syllabus. One who has just retired after many years' service said that it was a sheer impossibility and absurdity to seek to compel such stunted capacities to comprehend anything which required concentration of thought.

Various illustrations can be cited of teachers who have believed not these reports, but, with a faith in their own powers beautiful to behold, have made a brave fight to establish more advanced subjects,—several of such disillusioned ones

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

are personally known to the penner,—who after strenuous struggles have abandoned the position: beating the air is a singularly disheartening process. Even in lessons such as Drill when acumen is not demanded the body-conquering is noticeable. In every class there are children too weak to take muscular exercise, and many of the others are utterly wearied by half-an-hour's training.

In conclusion, we admit the failure but do not attribute it to the causes so frequently assigned, but to the dwarfing due to semi-starvation. Reforming the methods employed, altering the requirements, or any reform whatever will be futile: the sound, healthy body and teachable mind cannot be the lot of the youth of the nation under Capitalism.—KATE HAWKINS.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Branches and members should purchase their literature through the Party Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W. Write for particulars as to terms, etc.

CENTRAL ECONOMIC CLASS.

The class meets weekly and is free to all. On application to J. Fitzgerald, 34, Wilmington Square, London, W.C., full particulars will be sent.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

F. MEYER (Luxemburg).—Thanks for congratulations. We shall do our best to hold aloft the flag here.

J. E. (Kirkintilloch).—Back numbers have been sent and your request with regard to future issues shall be complied with.

FR. M. (Hamburg).—If you will state wherein we differ as to the tactics to be pursued by the Socialist Party, we shall be glad to discuss the matter with you. We shall welcome the notes promised. The historical sketches showing the development of free thought in this country would of course be of good educational value, and your suggestion will be borne in mind, but THE SOCIALIST STANDARD functions purely as a Socialist propagandist journal, and the calls on our limited space are too great already. When we can afford an enlarged issue the scope of our observations can be extended.

H. J. H. (Euston).—Business communications should be addressed as per official notice on page 4.

M. F. (Vienna).—Your request has been attended to.

J. H. W. (Denmark Hill).—Your communication is dealt with separately in this issue.

A. S. (Prague).—Remittances need not be crossed, we have not yet opened a banking account.

PECKHAM BRANCH.—Thanks for sight of document. It is being returned. Please inform your Branch Correspondent that reports should be sent to 5, Arvon Road, Highbury, N. A delay of one week has occurred in the receipt of the last communication owing to this instruction not being observed.

J. H. K. (Ilford), J. P. W. (Dulwich), and others.—Matter received.

MARX AS HUMORIST.

THE papers left by Karl Marx, which Engels had the intention to publish as fourth book of "Capital," were, after Engel's death, entrusted to Karl Kautsky, who is now about to commence their publication.

It has been recognised, however, that these notes could not be made a continuation of the unfinished "Capital." They will be issued as a study on the *Theories of Surplus-Value*, in three volumes, the first of which has just appeared.

We translate a passage therefrom, not, let it be understood, as being one of the most important, but to give our readers, as well as ourselves, the pleasure of again enjoying that caustic and cruelly paradoxical irony which is to be found in the notes to the first volume of "Capital." There Marx answers in this humorous fashion, by a *reductio ad absurdum*, the common-place vapourings of bourgeois economy about the "intellectual production" intended to extol the services rendered to the "national wealth" by the luxury and "intellectual labour" of the capitalist.

"A philosopher produces ideas, a poet verses, a preacher sermons, a professor text-books, etc. A criminal produces crimes. If we consider more in detail the relation which this last branch of production bears to Society as a whole, many prejudices will be removed.

"The criminal produces not alone crimes, but also criminal law, and thence the professor who gives lectures thereon, together with the inevitable text-books in which this very same professor throws his discourses in the quality of 'goods,' on the world market. Thus is an increase of the national wealth produced, without counting the individual joy which, according to a competent witness, Prof. Roscher, the manuscript of the text-book affords to the author himself.

"Moreover, the criminal produces all correctional and criminal justice, the police, judges, hangmen, juries, etc., as well as the various branches of industry, which form just as many categories of the division of social labour, develop different faculties of the human mind, create new wants, and new means of satisfying them. Torture more than anything else has given place to the most ingenious mechanical inventions, and employs in the production of its machines quite an army of honest artisans.

"The criminal produces an impression, good or bad, as the case may be, and thus renders a "service" to the movement of the moral and esthetic sentiments of the public. He produces not only text-books on criminal law, not only the penal law and thereby the legislators of the penal law, but also art, literature, novels, and even tragedies, as is proved by the *Faute de Mülner*, the *Brigands* of Schiller, and even by *Edipe* and *Richard III.* The criminal breaks the monotony and daily security of bourgeois life, and thus guarantees it against stagnation and arouses that excitement and restlessness without which even the spur of competition would be blunted. In this manner he furnishes a stimulant to the productive forces. While crime withdraws from the labour market a part of the superfluous population, thus diminishing competition among the workers, and preventing to a certain degree the fall of wages below the minimum, the war against crime absorbs another part of this same population. Thus it is that the criminal intervenes as a natural leveller, which restores a just equilibrium and opens up a new perspective of branches of 'useful' occupations.

"The influence of the criminal on the development of productive forces can be shown even in detail. Would the locksmiths have arrived at their present perfection were there no burglars? Would the making

of bank-notes have reached its present perfection if there were no forgers? Would the microscope have found its way in certain commercial spheres (the Babbage) without the existence of fraud in trade? Does not practical chemistry owe as much to the adulteration of goods, and to the efforts made for its detection, as to the noble zeal for production? Crime, by ever new means of attack against property, calls into being equally new means to defend it, and thus exercises an influence quite as productive as strikes on the invention of machines.

"And, if we leave aside consideration of individual crime, would the world market have existed without national crime, would even the national market have existed? Is it not the tree of sin which is, at the same time, since Adam, the tree of science?

"Mandeville, in his 'Fable of the Bees' (1705), had already demonstrated the productivity of all classes of trade in England, etc., and shows in general the tendency of all this reasoning: 'What we call evil in this world, the moral evil as well as natural evil, is the grand principle which makes of us social beings, is the solid foundation, the life and support of all industries and professions, without exception; it is there we should search for the true origin of all the arts, and all the sciences; and the moment that evil ceases to be, then Society will necessarily become corrupt, and dissolve completely.'

"But Mandeville is far bolder, and more straight forward than the narrow-minded apologists of middle-class Society."

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

PECKHAM.

In Peckham we have not been lacking in energy, our Branch meetings continue to be well attended.

We have had to give up outdoor meetings on account of the weather, but we intend to hold indoor meetings if we can manage to get the use of a school-room or any convenient place.

The Liberals have had another meeting in the Peckham Tabernacle, a hall that holds between three and four hundred people, but it received very little support, as there were only about one hundred persons present. They had a special speaker sent down by the Liberal Party, a Mr. Paul, who was assisted by Lord Monkswell, and others.

The meeting was in support of the candidature of Mr. Goddard Clark, a candidate by Devine right, who told the meeting that it cost him £5 more a week in sugar, and that it was time he entered Parliament as a Liberal. We fear, however, that it is not cheap sugar, but the sweets of office the Liberals want.

About a dozen of our members turned up, and made it very uncomfortable for Messrs. Paul, Monkswell, Clark & Co. with questions; so that they closed the meeting in a hurry, or, perhaps, the meeting was not quite so sweet enough for them, in spite of sugar.

Our Friday evening discussions still take place, and we shall be glad to welcome any comrades at them.

We also have a Tea and Social on the first Sunday in every month, at which we enjoy ourselves, and trust all comrades who can will come and enjoy themselves with us.

W. RUSSELL.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers, Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

CENTRAL OFFICE:
COMMUNIST CLUB,
107, CHARLOTTE ST., LONDON, W.
General Secretary C. LEHANE.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Business transacted every Saturday at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W. Membership in the Central Branch can be obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—Kate Hawkins, sec., 47, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 24, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST LONDON (Central).—G. Fletcher, Sec., 305, Wilmore Street, Bethnal Green, E. Branch meets every Friday at the Secretary's address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 35, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 40, Mablethorpe Rd., Fulham Cross, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m.

ISLINGTON.—Padraig Ua Toibin, Secretary, 38 Birnam Road, Tollington Park, N. Branch meets every 2nd and 4th Tuesday of the month at 8.30 p.m. at the "Hope Coffee Tavern," 112, Fonthill Road, Finsbury Park, N.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—J. Kent, Secretary, 6, Rutland Road, Ilford. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Fridays in each month at 8.30 at secretary's address.

SOUTHWARK.—S. Eden, Secretary, 68, Penrose St., Walworth. Branch meets every Friday at 8.30 p.m., at the Café, Walworth.

TOOTING.—C. Goss, Secretary, 73, Balham Grove, Balham, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at 61, Glasford Street, Tooting.

TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.

WATFORD.—D. R. Newlands, Secretary, 5, Highfield Rd., Bushey, Herts. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m., 73, Harwoods Rd., Watford. Economic Class every Sunday at 3 p.m.

WEST HAM.—G. J. Hodson, Secretary, 'Kelmescott,' Sidney Road, Forest Gate, E. Branch meets every alternate Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at the address given.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

SYDNEY HALL

38, YORK ROAD,

BATTERSEA, S.W.

Sunday Night Lectures.

The following Lectures will be delivered at the above hall during January:

Feb. 5: F. C. LEIGH.
Subject: CRIME and the CRIMINAL.

Feb. 12: JOHN KENT.
Subject: FREE TRADE a failure: PROTECTION hopeless; the real evil and only remedy.

Feb. 19: H. BELSEY.
Subject: EVOLUTION in SOCIETY.

Feb. 26: H. NEUMANN.
Subject: ORTHODOX POLITICS & MARXIAN ECONOMICS.

March 5: A. ANDERSON.
Subject: The CURSE of COM-PROMISE.

TIME 7 p.m. ADMISSION FREE.
ALL WORKERS INVITED.

* *Theorien über den Mehrwert*, aus dem nachgelassenem Manuskript *Zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* von Karl Marx, herausgegeben von Karl Kautsky.—*Die Anfänge der Theorie vom Mehrwert bis Adam Smith*.—Stuttgart, J. W. H. Dietz Nachf., 1905.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 7. Vol. I.]

LONDON, MARCH, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

A LOOK ROUND.

THE people of this country always forget and always forgive and the capitalist politicians can do and say anything without troubling whether they are acting consistently. Ofttimes they deliberately contradict themselves. It is part of the game.

Our fearful misgovernment of the Indian Empire has produced one of the most appalling famines on record, yet the English conquerors seem to be generally indifferent to the sufferings of the victims. . . . In face of these manifold wrongs the alleged Liberal leaders are silent. *What a contemptible gang!* . . . It was very amusing to hear Sir H. C. Bannerman say that the nation was "thunderstruck" at the revelations of Mr. Burdett-Coutts. Had he read "Reynold's Newspaper" he would have found during the last six months numerous letters from soldiers containing these exact charges. *It shows how well he is qualified for leadership, being unaware of the exposures which we have made.* W. M. T., in "Reynold's," July 8th, 1904.

We have no hesitation in saying that any Liberal member who, publicly or privately, intrigues to prevent Sir H. Campbell Bannerman from being the next Liberal premier, ought to be regarded as an enemy to the party of progress. The votes of the Radical Democrats ought to go to the Tory rather than to such a traitor to the decencies of public life in this country.

W. M. T., in "Reynold's," Feb. 12th, 1905.

For obvious reasons, lawyers, in particular, require good memories.

In a recent issue of the "Clarion," Mr. R. B. Suthers waxed indignant at the "raging, tearing, jingoistic screeching" of the "Daily Mail" because that journal perpetrated a provocative headline to a report of a certain rabid speech by a minor member of the Government surnamed Lee. The objectionable headline read "Our Naval Eye on Germany," and was calculated, says Mr. Suthers, "to foment hatred between us and Germany," and was therefore "wicked and criminal." Yet we do not remember to have read a similar condemnation of the "raging, tearing, jingoistic screeching" of Mr. Robert Blatchford, also of the "Clarion," who, a few weeks back, was so strenuously urging that we should keep our Military Eye on Germany because he thought he could see Germany's Naval Eye on us, and who was so anxious that we should be in a position to blow Germany out of the North Sea. Mr. Suthers' just and righteous indignation would be more effective if he had first given some indication of his desire to set his own house in order. As it is, his protest falls flat because it does not ring true and he lays himself open to the retort discourteous of the "Daily Mail."

He was going the next day with other comrades to meet the Prime Minister. (A voice: "What's the good?") He did not think it would be much good but if the proposals they laid before him were carried out he believed it would

be the means of remedying for the time being some of the misery which they saw around them. W. THORNE, at Canning Town, Feb. 6th, 1905.

All the money coming into West Ham had hindered them from carrying on the fight so vigorously as they might otherwise have done, for when they had wiped out a little of the misery the workers had become the more contented and drifted back into the old conditions.

A. HAYDAY, at the same meeting.

"What's the good" of raising false hopes in the hearts of the people and encouraging them to look to the capitalist party to deal with the unemployed problem? What's the good of neglecting revolutionary propaganda in order to distribute relief tickets? Is there not a sufficient number of charity-mongers to do this propping up of the capitalist system? Hayday, Jack Jones, McAllen, Mercer and others could surely find more useful employment, from a Socialist standpoint, than that of appealing to the exploiters to "lull the cry of toil and spare a trifle from the spoil."

Hodge is a poor patient plodder, who lives his monotonous life driving horses and waggons, toiling in damp fields, and drinking in village ale-houses, with sage and onions hanging from the rafters and sawdust strewn over the floors. . . . He jogs out his plodding, patient, uncomplaining existence until, rheumatic-ridden, he inevitably seeks aid from the rural guardians, to be questioned sharply by the chairman, with the white waistcoat and the double chin, as to his sinful remissness in neglecting to provide for himself in old age. Provide for old age out of 10s. a week and a cottage!—something less than the price of a bottle of champagne squandered by his "betters" in a flash London bar any night.—LONDON OPINION.

"As Artemus Ward held that an occasional joke improved a comic paper, I hold that a Socialist paper should contain some Socialism," says Mr. R. Blatchford in the "Clarion." After this avowal we shall look forward to future issues of that journal with great expectations.

We greatly regret that Councillor Ewell Mc Allen, of the S.D.F., is pursuing a line of conduct which is not only calculated to bring that body into disrepute, but also to discredit the Socialist movement in general. At a meeting of the West Ham Town Council last month he "let himself go" with the following choice interruptions: "Dirty Crow, black Crow!" "You paralysed parasite! You greasy reptile! You miserable liar!" "Sit down, monkey face!" "Withdraw, you cur. Monkey face, withdraw. You cur!" Any person of average intelligence can acquire a sufficient knowledge of the Socialist position to be enabled to crush his opponents by irrefutable arguments, without recourse to mere abuse. If Councillor McAllen does not recognise this or has not sufficiently studied Socialism to place himself in a position to argue with its antagonists, then he should surely resign his public position until, by study and reflection, he has become a really "fit and proper person" to champion the Cause.

The Saturday evening editions of the "King's Lynn News" have contained some caustic comments on the recent actions of Mr. J. J. Kidd, who has suggested that £25 should be raised for the purpose of contesting Lynn, in order to "teach the Liberal Party a few lessons." We think those who read the letters which we printed in our last issue will agree that this shining light of the S.D.F. Executive should learn the elementary principles of Socialist policy before attempting to instruct the Liberals.

By the way, this party which is to be "taught lessons," has been described in the Critical, but not always careful, Chronicle of "Justice" as "having become entirely and hopelessly demoralised, without leaders, without a policy, or principles, or enthusiasm, or initiative, or vigour" and as "absolutely dead and done for." Why, then, should the S.D.F. worry about it?

The "King's Lynn News" reprints the greater portion of our comments on the Jermyn-Kidd incident and thinks that our "drastic language" is "calculated to make Mr. Kidd throw a flower pot at the neighbour's cat." No one more deeply regrets than we the necessity for such "drastic language," although, of course, the S.D.F. will not consider that anything wrong was done. That Body officially supports Liberal candidates and permits its members to do so. Mr. Kidd, therefore, only did that which the Body has already sanctioned.

In one respect, however, it is necessary to correct the "King's Lynn News." It says "Mr. Kidd gets it hot and strong from the official organ of his own party." Let it be distinctly understood that Mr. Kidd is in no way connected with The Socialist Party of Great Britain. He is, as we have already stated, a member of the Executive Council of the Social-Democratic Federation, which declares that between Liberalism and Socialism there is not only opposition of tactics, but also antagonism of principle, which it is impossible to get over. Therefore to pretend to be on good terms with people who are not going their way and have no intention of travelling in their direction would be to hamper the action of Socialism in regard to matters which they deem crucial. This position was stated by H. M. Hyndman at Holborn Town Hall, on April 9th, 1899. But the S.D.F. has long since ceased to practise that which it preaches, hence the recent split and the founding of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. As a member of the S.D.F., even as one of the Executive of that body, Mr. Kidd did nothing extraordinary in supporting a Liberal, although his methods were somewhat clumsy. No member of The Socialist Party of Great Britain would be permitted to support a Liberal or any other non-Socialist. As will be seen by the Declaration of Principles on page 7, the Party enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist. It is definite in policy as well as principle and for that reason the working-class will, sooner or later, recognise that it is the only party worthy of their confidence and support.

J. KAY.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION.

There appears to be some confusion of thought among Socialists as to the true value and relative application of the words "evolution" and "revolution."

Influenced doubtless by Karl Kantaky's reasoning in his "Social Revolution," many students of sociology believe that the terms are synonymous. So far from this being the case, the words and the meaning they convey are in direct antagonism, as I shall try to prove.

Before the great French Revolution, society in France was evolving along certain lines, that is to say, a section of the community was becoming rich or prodigal, or both, by the degradation, exploitation, and enslavement of the other section. Therefore, the tendency of the evolution of that society was to make a clear and ever more accentuated line of division between rich and poor, aristocrat and peasant.

The Revolution destroyed all that, cutting off for the time being all such tendency. In short, the Revolution put a period to the evolution of society as then constituted.

It may be contended that French society having evolved to a certain point, a change was inevitable. Even so, the change was none the less a revolution in that it altered most effectually the existing order of things, which, left to themselves—that is, had natural evolution been unchecked—would have developed into something quite different.

Here we may see the fundamental difference between evolution and revolution. The former means a gradual growth from *that* to *this*, with a connecting link so closely forged that the careful student may clearly see the second evolved from the first.

On the other hand, revolution is a force which comes in at certain periods, completely snapping the connecting link between the old and the new, rendering impossible, for the time at least, the further development of the old. The change revolution produces may of course go on evolving, but we must not forget that revolution brought that particular phase of evolution into existence. In doing this it necessarily destroyed the line of evolution which preceded the outbreak or upheaval, proving that revolution was opposed to evolution on those lines.

But, you will say, the Revolution aided the evolution of the French to a higher conception of equity and brotherhood. Quite so, but that by no means proves that revolution is an essential part of evolution, or that in fact it has any collateral relationship. Perhaps my meaning may be made clearer by an illustration.

If we took a boy from sordid and degraded surroundings and placed him in a refined and cultured environment, we should have revolutionised the life of that boy. His evolution to manhood would continue at about the same rate as if he had been left in the slum, but the evolutionary process would be of an entirely different nature. This change would have been brought about by stopping his old line of evolution and starting him on a new one—in other words, revolution has stepped in and performed its function, which is checking one form of evolution and supplanting it by another.

Now supposing that after the boy had spent two years in his superior environment, we then return him to the slum. That would mark another revolution in his life, and by that act you would be doing your utmost to set up the process of involution, which is the opposite to evolution. In short, you would be trying to get that boy back to the state in which you found him.

What may be said of the individual may be said of nations, and thus we see that revolution can not only elevate, that is, evolve, but it has power to degrade, to lower, to involve; again proving it is distinct from evolution, for were it the same thing it could not act in opposition to itself.

I am quite aware that an individual may rise above or fall below his environment, but that in no way affects the force of my illustration.

Involution is quite as important a factor in this question as evolution, for it has manifested itself, more or less, through every revolution.

For instance, the French people made no practical or lasting use of their splendid opportunities. There was in their Revolution the

usual three turns of the wheel. First, the moderate movement forward, then, after a time, the second, then the extreme party which created a reaction against the revolution, when the wheel moved backwards—involution. First, the Girondists, second, the Jacobins, then the reaction to monarchy.

So, then, we see that revolution can both build up and pull down, the latter power being altogether outside the province of evolution.

This should be quite sufficient to prove that the two words we are discussing do not mean one and the same thing, but let us go a little further.

The capitalist system was not caused by direct revolution; it evolved; that is to say, it was established gradually, imperceptibly. The fact that the introduction of machinery later on brought about an industrial revolution in no way militates against this statement, for machinery was an outgrowth of the capitalist system, it did not produce it. The change it caused in the methods of production then prevailing, however, constituted a revolution, a revolution which cut off at once the further development of the old machinery.

The same may be said of many other things. For example, gunpowder as an aid to slaughter, was not evolved through the weapons of its day. It was a distinct invention or discovery, and its introduction caused a revolution in the art of war.

The application of steam to locomotion was also a revolution, for it did not evolve through the old stage coaches or any other then known means of transit; it was in fact a separate discovery. But having proved its usefulness, the application of steam has gone on being evolved right down to the present day. Electricity in its turn has produced a revolution in the application of energy.

Neither of these forces became known through a channel which may be termed evolutionary, for neither grew out of its immediate predecessor in the world of dynamics.

Let me give another illustration; the well-known one of the egg and the chicken.

In this case, nature's design—if I may use such a term in this connection—is to evolve from the germ within the egg a member of the species by which that egg was laid. To bring that member to maturity, or in other words, to evolve it, so that it may in turn assist in the propagation of its species, is surely a natural law.

Anything which interferes with the action of that law is revolutionary, bringing evolution to a halt, either in the egg or the chicken. That is to say, if I break the shell before the chicken is ready for its new conditions, I am displacing evolution by revolution. If I kill the chicken before it is matured, I am doing the same thing.

Evolution, beginning with the germ in the egg, is not complete till that germ has evolved into the fully matured bird, the breaking of the shell when the chicken emerges being a vital part of this evolution; it in no way constitutes a revolution.

The same may be said of a human being. From conception to maturity is one regular process of evolution, each succeeding stage depending in sequential order on the preceding. The birth of a child, therefore, is an essential part of its evolution towards manhood or womanhood, and is no more a revolution than the cutting of its teeth, the dawn of its intelligence, its first attempt to walk, or in short, any part of its prenatal or breathing existence, each stage, as we have seen, necessarily depending upon the other.

It may be as De Vries says, that catastrophic changes have occurred in the development of organisms, which he avers have suddenly "exploded" and given life to numerous new forms.

That is the point. A sudden change from old forms to new goes to make a revolution; that which we may term natural and observed evolution being for the time superseded by something temporarily more powerful than itself.

In the birth of a child no such change occurs. The birth takes place, so far as we are aware, exactly as births have always taken place; there is no catastrophic change to the child; it was formed in the image of its parents before it appeared. It was intended for a human being, it is a human being; it was destined to evolve to maturity, it will evolve to maturity, unless revolution, which did not attend at its birth, steps

in and cuts that evolution short.

I am aware that the evolution of society has always led to the various revolutions within that society, for it is impossible to get away from evolution anywhere or in anything, but we must always remember that revolution has also its evolutionary stages, even though of itself it is no more evolution than man himself. In both, the power to advance comes from a force stronger than themselves, proving that though they are subject to evolution they are yet distinct from it, for surely nothing can be subject to itself.

Another little illustration. A man hews down a tree and plants a sapling, so cutting short the evolution of the tree and aiding the evolution of the sapling. He thus stands as Revolution to that which he destroys and that which he plants, acting revolution's double part of destruction and beneficence; but who would argue from this that the man is the same thing as the evolution of those trees. A revolution in society is quite as distinct.

Again, if we grow grapes in a hot-house, we can develop them faster than when we grow them in the open, but the stages of evolution from the slip to the matured fruit are identical. The natural development is hastened, but no revolution takes place, unless it should be found, for instance, that a cabbage was growing where a bunch of grapes ought to have been. That we might term a catastrophic change—in short, a revolution.

Now as the whole of my efforts so far have been directed towards showing the difference between evolution and revolution, I need not pause to combat the belief, held by many, that the present social system, will, of its own inherent qualities, ultimately lead to Socialism; but this much may be said: if Socialism evolves from this system, there can be no revolution, for none will be needed.

Were it possible to establish Socialism in our country within the next few years, that would certainly constitute a revolution; but wait for Socialism to evolve from the present system, and I rather think we are in for a pretty long wait, for to be evolutionary it would have to be established as gradually as was the prevailing order of society; the State, bit by bit, taking control of everything essential; the people, department by department, taking control of the State, until the State became the people.

That would be the evolution of Socialism, and in the process it would probably have to pass through stages of development of which none of us at present have any conception—other systems possibly intervening—and would doubtless run through many generations in the transition; for the cream of the power of human evolution always lies with the governors of society, and it is only reasonable to assume that they would stretch every stage to breaking point before they gave way.

Briefly, then, the evolution of Socialism from the present system would mean progress by reform—a higher development of society attained by gradual and easy stages, nobody's corns being trodden upon in the process. Were Socialism established by revolution, it would have to be by a sudden, and, comparatively speaking, instant turnover.

Therefore, the man who calls himself a Revolutionary Socialist, while devoting his energies to reforms, has no very clear perception of the difference between the two forces we have under consideration. He should style himself an Evolutionary Socialist. Believing, as he necessarily must, that the more reforms he can wrest from the governing class the nearer he gets to the day of emancipation, he cannot logically term himself anything else.

Where in the past history of the world have beneficial reforms led up to revolution? Personally, I know of no single instance, and should be much surprised to hear of one. But in any case, to work for, and obtain reforms, and then expect that these reforms will lead eventually to revolution, is simply absurd. To reach Socialism by such methods would be evolution, not revolution.

All revolutions which have not been spontaneous have been planned, the malcontents working hard to gain sufficient numerical strength to strike. A revolution to Socialism from the present system must be brought about in the same way, or it will never be brought about at all. The more society is reformed, the less likelihood

THE TACTICS OF CONFUSION.

Mr. John Burns is "Labour" M.P. for Battersea. He is also (vide the "Capital-and-Labour-are-brothers" Press) the "Statesman of Labour." As "Statesman of Labour" he draws a salary of £5 per week. The amount is made up by contributions from "Friends of Labour." For this purpose "Friends of Labour" are those who subscribe to the wages fund of the "Statesman of Labour."

One such "friend" is Sir C. M. Palmer, M.P., a shipping and mining magnate. This gentleman also doubtless holds that Capital and Labour are brothers. As representing capital, he sends a contribution (probably handsome) to his Brother Burns, representing "Labour."

Brother Burns is very pleased. He sends, per his wages fund secretary, best wishes for the success of Brother Palmer's candidature at Jarrow. Also best thanks for the contribution. Especially the latter.

But at Jarrow Brother Pete Curran, "labour candidate," is opposing Brother Palmer, "capitalist candidate." And Brother Palmer is using Brother Burns' best wishes against Brother Pete. Whereat Pete waxes exceeding wrath (which is silly) and, through his secretary, demands explanations (which are obvious).

Brother Burns' letter is an exhibition of statesmanship. Brother Pete has not subscribed to the wages fund of the "Labour Statesman"; Brother Palmer has. Only dogs bite the hand that feeds them, and Brother Burns is not a dog.

Moreover, Brother Pete is identified with that knot of recalcitrant "labour men"—M.P.'s actual or embryonic—who a short time back made nasty remarks about, and refused to bend the knee to, the "Statesman of Labour." Brother Burns gets even by opposing Pete's progress toward Parliamentary position. *Acerima Prociurum odia!*

The matter has since been carried a step further, and stands somewhat after this wise:

(1) The "labour men" give it as their opinion that the "Labour Statesman" is much more concerned with the interests of the "Statesman of Labour" than the interests of Labour.

(2) The "Labour Statesman" retorts that the "labour men" have sold themselves, or are anxious to sell themselves, for 200 dirty pieces of gold.

(3) The "labour" men reply that the "Labour Statesman" has nothing to sell, having long since sold all he had—or words to that effect.

(4) The "Labour Statesman" gets even by supporting the "labour exploiter" in opposition to the "labour candidate," whereupon

(5) The "labour members" elect the "Labour Statesman" to the position of chairman of the "labour group" in the House of Commons, what time the Secretary of the "labour candidate" pathetically appeals for someone to unravel the tangled skein.

It is very nice and pretty, so helpful; such a delightful comedy in five acts. And the working-class must be very proud of their champions, and very appreciative of their champions' labours.

But, levity apart, is it not time the working-class called upon these self-styled labour leaders, these vain-glorious mouthers of paltry platitude and empty phrases, these glib-tongued political tricksters who are more concerned with their personal standing than with the vindication of the rights of those they are alleged to represent; is it not time the workers called upon these men to "cease their damnable faces" and quit the positions they cannot fill, making way for those who, knowing the workers' condition and the reasons for it, are prepared to work with a single mind for the realisation of those changes which will ensure the application of the only remedy for working-class ills; men who are prepared to fight all the forces that capitalism and landlordism can array against them until the victory is won that will enable the workers to enjoy the full results of their labour and usher in that co-operative commonwealth toward which the Socialist Party, the world over, is pressing? Surely it is time! Surely the workers will

refuse to be fooled much longer by men who, even when they are not ignorant of the real causes underlying working-class poverty and unhappiness, are prepared to fritter away their opportunities, are prepared to play into the hands of the enemy, are prepared to betray the cause they claim to represent, to effect their own aggrandisement or enrichment—squabbling and bickering over the partition of the spoil like hungry dogs at a bone.

Surely the workers will soon demand, and see that they get, real representation by men who are prepared to take the line imperatively demanded by a clear understanding of the issues, the line of irreconcilable opposition, all the time, to every person or party occupying other than the Socialist position.

Capitalism is the enemy. Who supports capitalism is the enemy. Who supports the hirelings of capitalism is the enemy. Burns is clearly supporting the capitalist class. The Labour Representation Committee men in the House of Commons, together with the other "labour" M.P.'s, support Burns by electing him to the chairmanship of their group. These are the enemies of Labour.

The Social-Democratic Federation and the Independent Labour Party support capitalist candidates. They ally themselves with and make arrangements with capitalist parties. They seek to win votes by tricking the workers. They call their candidates "labour candidates" because they fear that by preaching the Socialism they privately profess they will not poll such a large vote. By supporting capitalist candidates they support working-class enemies. By obscuring the Socialism they know to be the only remedy for working-class evils they confuse the issues and perpetuate working-class ignorance. These, therefore, are also the enemies of Labour.

That is the position, and presently the worker will understand. When they do they will win to their freedom. Perhaps the time is not yet—but that is not the fault of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. From all parties we stand out—a finger-post pointing for ever to the road along which the workers must travel if they would achieve their emancipation. And at the end of the road is—Socialism!—A.J.M.G.

[Since the foregoing was written, the Secretary of the Battersea Liberal and Radical Association has explained that his appeal to Sir C. Palmer was made on behalf of the Registration Fund of that body, not for the John Burns' Wages Fund, and that Burns was in no way responsible for it. He adds that in acknowledging the donation he, "as a matter of courtesy," wished him (Sir C. Palmer) every success.]

The precise value of this explanation is not easily estimated. The money was not for Burns' Wages Fund, but only to make a wages fund necessary by securing the election of Burns. The wish for the success of Sir C. Palmer was only expressed as a matter of courtesy, not, presumably, with the idea of assisting to realise the wish. Burns had no knowledge of the matter, and will therefore, perhaps, repudiate the action—if he objects to it. The "labour" candidate for Jarrow may now be mollified. Certainly Sir C. Palmer will not be unduly depressed.]

After hearing a deputation of unemployed the Paddington Borough Council hastily but unanimously decided to convene a special meeting of the works committee to consider the question and, as the unemployed were still gathered outside the town hall, the town clerk went outside and announced the decision. Further, the mayor's son, who is also a councillor, promised to give every unemployed man present a good dinner. *Upon that the assembled men drifted away.*—Daily Express.

Your social reformer may explain this away as he likes, but seeing that crime is largely due to poverty and want in the case of the first offender, and that the frequent reappearance of the "habitual criminal" is to some extent evidence of the failure of our most expensive machinery for the punishment and diminution of crime, the English taxpayer is naturally alarmed when he finds that, even the great prosperity which the Government Departments depict can be accompanied by a great and increasing amount of crime.—*Capitalist Press.*

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

H. PHILPOT WRIGHT.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

To facilitate the transaction of the business of the Editorial and Management Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to conduct its official Organ, members of the Party and other readers are particularly requested to address all literary communications to the *Editorial Committee, 5, Arvon Road, Highbury, N.*, and all business correspondence, including Subscriptions and Advertisements, to *A. Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.*

(Signed) C. LEHANE, Secretary,
Editorial and Management Committee.

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months	£ s. d.
...	0 1 6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion	£ s. d.
Quarter Column do.	0 2 0
Half Column do.	0 5 6
One Column do.	0 10 0
...	1 0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1905.

THE POLITICAL ORGANISATION OF THE WORKING-CLASS.

PARLIAMENT has reassembled. The forces of Toryism and Liberalism have mustered at Westminster. The old farce is carried merrily on. But in this reassembling how are the wisecracks of the Press falsified! Have they not told us that dissolution was imminent—that probably the Tories, suffering from senility and torn by inward dissension, would not dare to come forward again with a programme for another session. And the Tory government comes forward gaily—as a Liberal government would do in its place—determined to hold on to office as long as it can.

The Tory programme, too, seems cleverly arranged for the double purpose of dishing the Liberals and of catching votes. How else is it possible to account for the expressed intention to pass measures for the appointment of authorities to deal with the unemployed, for amending and extending the Workmen's Compensation Acts, for the establishing of a ministry of commerce and industry, for the notification of industrial accidents?

"Ah! but it depends on what these measures will mean in practice," we hear an indignant Liberal muttering. That is, of course, very true and we Socialists know full well that the Tory government is not likely to take much trouble in the direction of adequately redressing the grievances of the workers. But neither are the Liberals. And the Liberals know, when they prate about "giving redress to the conditions prevailing among the working classes" (they mean the working-class), about free breakfast tables, about taxation of land values, about old age pensions, and a thousand and one other things, that they have no intention of passing measures for the benefit of the working-class. "Dealing with the unemployed" means something very different when used by Tory, Liberal, and Socialist, and so with other reforms.

What we have to recognise is that no matter what professions they may make, the Liberals and Tories in the House of Commons represent, in the first place, the interests of property. So long as they can maintain the rights of private property, and the privileges and vested interests which have twined themselves round private property, they are content.

But in conserving the rights of private property they occasionally find the vested interests of one section of property-holders conflict with those of another section. When the machine

industry was in its infancy the conflict between the machine or factory-owner and the landowner—the commercial and the landed interest—crystallised itself into two great political parties, the Whig and the Tory. And so to-day we find that the divisions in political life are but the reflex of property relations and the conflict of interests between property-owners.

Again, whenever the development of industry, the opening up of new countries to commerce, or the introduction of a fresh motive-power in production brings about changes in the world of commerce and thence creates new industrial interests, we find new lines of demarcation among the political factions. A Tory government which would impose an additional duty of 2/- on every barrel of beer would convert every brewer to Liberalism. A Liberal government which refused to renew the Agricultural dole would force large numbers of the "landed gentry" into the Tory camp.

But why should we labour this point? Every section of the community except the working-class has known and admitted it any time this last fifty years. And the worker must one day wake to it and to the fact that as each other section of the community looks after its own sectional interest he, too, must look after his class interest and achieve his class emancipation.

Why cannot the worker learn this lesson? Every day some action of the political factions cries it out to him. Every time the public Press—as much the slave of privilege and vested interest as the political faction—takes up some question of interest to the worker it is for objects other than his benefit. Questions of unemployment and distress afford good copy when Parliament is not sitting and are entirely neglected when parliamentary reports are forthcoming.

The worker has then to learn that the Liberal and the Tory are alike indifferent to his welfare. That however much they may coquet with him at election times when his vote is useful, they will do nothing which endangers the property rights of their class. That though they may resent the tyrannical actions of a Penrhyn, it is but because such actions endanger their existence as a class when the workers recognise that they are all potential Penrhyns.

When the worker has learnt his lesson; when he knows he must rely upon himself and upon his fellows what is he to do? How is he to apply his knowledge to matters of everyday importance to him? It is evidently futile for him to assert his independence of the other political factions if he is independently to strive for measures which those factions advocate. It is also useless for him to organise himself into a party which is unable to agree upon a working programme and a common line of action.

To us as Socialists it is clear that, the Liberals and the Tories having been thrown over as parties, the principles for which they work must also be thrown over, and that, therefore, anyone holding the opinions either of Liberalism or of Toryism must be left outside the workers' party. The party of the workers has interests which have no common bond with Liberalism or Toryism, and the party of the workers must, therefore, steer clear of anything which is in any way allied with these parties.

The political party of the workers must be the reflex of the economic interests of the workers who are the propertyless class, in the same way as the other parties reflect the economic interests of the propertied class. We are then driven to the necessity of searching for the economic interest of the worker. And this we find in the principle that the working-class

having created all the wealth of society are the rightful owners of that wealth. Every man should receive the product of his own labour, but as in modern society it is impossible to determine the portion which any individual adds to the value of the articles he helps to create, we must be content to let all those who labour remain joint owners of the aggregate product.

This, however, is not what obtains in modern society where the reverse is the case. In modern society to-day the non-producers of wealth are the joint owners of the aggregate amount of wealth produced. In this fact we have surely the true differentiation of the party of the workers from the party of the property-owners. And the first object of the political party of the workers, therefore, should be the securing for workers as a class the fruits of their own labour.

If they can only secure this they will have no need to worry about limiting the hours of work, securing a legal law of minimum, or returning to the *status quo ante* Taff Vale. These trifling matters will soon adjust themselves when the workers take as their own the product of their own labour. And resulting from this would come the necessity of the present property-owners, unable longer to live on the fruits of other men's labour, working so as to secure their own livelihood.

This means the establishment of a system of society in which the livelihood of the people is duly considered as one of the primal ends of the society's existence, and that as each member of the society obtains a livelihood, so each such member must do his share in its necessary work.

When this is secured it will follow that the usefulness of every article produced will be considered before it is made, and that all work done for the manufacture and exchange of useless or inferior articles will be eliminated. This will permit of a thorough organisation of industry, all forms of useless labour being dispensed with and everyone sharing in the performance of the resulting necessary work.

Such a system of society would allow the development of everyone's individuality which is to-day too often crushed out in mine, factory, or workshop, and would mean freedom, comfort, and happiness, each in their fullest measure, to the mass of mankind.

Such a social regime would be a Socialist society—the Socialist Republic—and the party which must achieve it is the working-class, politically organised as a Socialist party, the nucleus of which is to be found in The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

TRADE DISPUTES IN 1904.

THE Board of Trade reports that in 1904 there were 334 disputes, affecting 83,922 workers. The aggregate duration in working days was 1,416,265. Wages were the cause of 66 per cent. of the disputes, affecting 55,955 people (67 per cent. of the total involved). Refusal to work with non-unionists and other questions of principle accounted for 15 disputes. It is alleged that 58 disputes, affecting 15,338 work-people, ended in their favour, 161 (affecting 21,332 persons) in favour of the employers, while 105 cases (affecting 16,229 workers) were compromised. Taking the percentages based on the number of work-people directly affected, the balance of success appears to have been with the employers.

Most of the disputes were settled by direct negotiation between the parties concerned or their representatives. Of the 334 disputes recorded, 214, affecting 57,043 work-people, were thus settled. In 56 disputes, affecting 6,803 work-people, the employers succeeded in replacing the workers, and in 26 disputes work was resumed by the work-people without negotiations. The number of disputes settled by conciliation and arbitration was 23, in which 5,902 work-people were involved.

MAKING WORK.

A LOT of people seem to think that making work is a good thing, that capitalists who provide employment are useful people, in fact, that they are so necessary that workmen cannot do without them. It is my purpose in this article to try to show that this is not true.

As it is very difficult to deal with a community of 40 millions of human beings engaged in thousands of different ways in earning a living, I propose to reduce the community to say 100 men. Now we will suppose that one man owns all the land and another all the machinery, the other men therefore have nothing, but are able and willing to work. The Landowner says, "Well, my friends, I will give you the opportunity of working on my land, but you must grow rose trees and give me a third of them by way of rent;" the owner of the machinery, tools, etc., says, "Well, my friends, you cannot plough and dig without tools, I will let you use my tools, but you must give me a third of the rose trees you produce by way of interest."

This is making work, but the biggest dunce can see that such a community would soon be starving, since humanity does not feed on rose trees, so that the mere making of work is not a good thing. Now suppose the Landowner said, "Well, my friends, 50 of you can use my land and grow wheat, fruit and vegetables, and 20 of you can build me a palace to live in and a decent sized house which I can let to the owner of the machinery, etc., and also 98 small cottages and I will pay you in kind;" the owner of the tools says to the remaining 28 men, "If you care to make some good clothes in my factory for me to wear and some to sell to the Landowner and some shoddy clothing for the rest of the community, I will pay you in kind."

In the course of time the palace is finished and the Landowner lives in it; the wheat, fruit and vegetables are reared and the Landowner takes his share, picking out the best, out of which he pays the owner of the factory for his good clothes; the good clothing is made and the owner of the factory is well-dressed and draws his share of the best wheat, fruit and vegetables from the workers who have hired his tools, and out of that share pays the Landowner the rent of his decent house. Net result: the two rich men, without doing a stroke of work, have got the best houses to live in, the best clothes to wear, and the best wheat, fruit and vegetables to eat, whilst the workers, who have produced everything, get the small cottages to live in, the shoddy clothing to wear, and the worst wheat, fruit and vegetables to eat. It seems perfectly clear, therefore, that an injustice has been done to the workers, and that instead of being good men, the Landowner and the owner of the machinery, tools, etc., have robbed the workers of two-thirds of the result of their labour. Let us go a little further. The two owners get such a large store of wheat, fruit and vegetables, which with all their gluttony they have not been able to consume, that it becomes no longer worth their while to allow the workers to grow any more, so they (the workers) are discharged, and seeing that with all their industry, thrift, and frugal living they could not, out of the paltry share of produce allowed them, put by sufficient to live on for many days, it is not long before they are starving, whilst the owners, with all their idleness, waste, and greediness, have enough to last them many months. Poverty has now been born, but in case it might teach the workers a lesson and cause a revolt, the owners offer work of another kind to about seventy, some (the biggest) they make policemen to protect their property, some magistrates, to sit in judgment on, and deal out punishment to their brother workers, who, impelled by the pangs of hunger, help themselves to the produce which they themselves created, but which somehow or other (they don't exactly know how) has become the property of the Landowner and factory owner.

Having now arrived at our present system of society, with its Landowners, Factory Owners, Magistrates, Policemen, etc., it will be clear to you that the number of men engaged in producing food, clothing and shelter has been considerably reduced, and it is just as clear that those who are producing have to produce the

same quantity as when more were producing, with the inevitable result, that they have to work longer hours with greater intensity for the same reward. What a strange thing it is, that it has not yet dawned upon the minds of the workers, that it would be more fair for 98 men to rule their own lives and those of the other two, than to allow the other two to rule theirs.

The way to bring about the desired change is very simple, the 98 men must go to the two men and say, "Friends, the land is a gift of nature to all men, machinery and all the means of production have been brought into existence by the energy and industry of the workers. We purpose, therefore, taking over the land and the means of production and working them in the interest of all and you will then have to contribute your share of the labour which is necessary to provide the sustenance and comfort essential to the well-being of the community." If this were done it appears to me that, with our increased knowledge of organised production and distribution, the present industrial hell would be converted into a heaven of delight, where peace and plenty would bring joy and happiness to one and all.—J. H. KENNETT.

English Hypocrisy and the Russian Outrages.

THE huge wave of indignation that has lately been sweeping over the country on account of the massacres in Russia is typical of the hypocrisy of the capitalist-class and the ignorance of the man in the street. Big headlines and stirring articles have proved effective in arousing a strong and quite unjustified feeling against Russia. The English attitude towards Russian affairs has for long been intensely pharisaical, and its real origin, imperial and commercial jealousy in Asia, has been quite lost sight of by the public. First of all, at the beginning of the war, there was a popular expression of sympathy towards Japan, as being the "little nation"—England's treatment of "little nations" has been well exemplified in South Africa! Next came a patriotic frenzy because some panic-stricken Russian seamen saw visions and killed or wounded a few defenceless fishermen: the killing and wounding of thousands of defenceless men, women, and children by defective machinery, deliberate starvation and disease brought on by neglect, barely call forth any protest, save occasionally for political purposes. Finally, we have now a great shriek of horror arising because the capitalist and bureaucratic-class in Russia is determined, as it is in every country, to use every means to keep the working-class in subjection.

This feeling is quite unjustified from a capitalist point of view, and further it is only hypocritical, for no one, except a Socialist, can with honesty support the working-class in its efforts towards freedom. Yet we find the same people that would cheerfully starve out English strikers or shoot them down if more convenient, that ignored the fearful outrages in Colorado, and that approved the recent shooting of strikers in Italy, pretending to be horrified at the actions of their fellow-capitalists in Russia!

Perhaps it may be urged, as in the "Daily Mail," that the Russian worker is more downtrodden than the English, and that, moreover, it is not a working-class revolt. But the fact that the Liberals use the present time to put forward their political claims, does not detract from the fact that it is the Russian worker who is revolting and suffering for it; and, as regards the Russian being more down-trodden, he only lacks the political freedom of his English fellow, and that political power used, as it is in England, to strengthen the hands of his masters, counts for nought, and only leads the worker to a false sense of liberty, for the economic slavery remains as binding in England as in Russia.

This pretended sympathy is therefore arrant humbug or cant, calculated only to dupe the British worker and reconcile him to his slavery. It is quite time that he should realise that he is being deceived and that the aims of the working-class are the same all over the world.

If any worker is really anxious to support his class in Russia, England, or any other country, let him declare his allegiance to working-class politics and join The Socialist Party of Great Britain.—SIDNEY CHASE.

PARTY NOTES.

THE first Annual Conference of The Socialist Party of Great Britain will be held at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, London, W., on Thursday, 20th April, 1905, commencing at 7 p.m., and on Friday 21st April, when the proceedings will be resumed at 9 a.m. The constitution of the Conference is defined by Rules 22, 23, and 24.

During March there will be two meetings of the Executive Council, viz., Saturday 4th, at 3 p.m., and Tuesday 21st, at 7 p.m. Usual place.

A meeting of Speakers and prospective Speakers will take place on Saturday, March 4th, at the Communist Club. Several important matters in connection with the forthcoming open-air propaganda will be discussed. Time—7.30 p.m.

Members and others are requested to note that, a vote of the Party having been taken, H. J. Hawkins was on February 4th, 1905, expelled from membership of The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Notification has been received from the International Socialist Bureau that V. Serwy has resigned the Secretaryship. Camille Huysmans has been appointed to the position, and the offices of the Bureau are now at the Maison du Peuple, Brussels.

Will Branch Secretaries and members note that I no longer reside at Birnam Road? All communications should be forwarded to the Central Office, Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, London, W.—C. LEHANE.

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

PECKHAM.

THE condition of the Peckham Branch is very satisfactory. A few open-air meetings have been held when weather permitted. Our members meet regularly for economic study and discussion and are preparing themselves for the season of open-air propaganda. The tone of the membership is admirable: the idea is to steadfastly advocate the social revolution and to leave to compromisers their rose-water for the plague.

Mr. Herbert Burrows, lecturing recently in Camberwell on the unemployed question, argued at the outset that until the workers become class-conscious, and understand the nature of the class-war, no project intended to remedy unemployment can succeed, and then proceeded to advocate the institution of farm colonies, in conjunction with communal workshops in urban centres, mutual exchange of produce, and distribution of surplus amongst the producers. Then, seemingly aware of the incompatibility of his contentions, the lecturer endeavoured to show that, while his proposals were not the solution, they were the "seeds of the solution" of the problem. These colonies and workshops, once established, would by their extension and development—one almost sees the S.D.F. sowing and some helpful capitalist administration supplying the water—"dislocate capitalist industry"! Replying to criticism by our comrades the lecturer condemned as futile his own scheme by pleading that it was advocated "only as an infinitesimally small and temporary measure of relief at the present time. A report of this meeting appearing in "Justice," designated those who failed to be charmed by Mr. Burrows' utopian illusions, "impossibilists"; and the honest reporter was so "amused" by the criticism that he appears to have forgotten that Mr. Burrows was twice challenged to debate the unemployed question, but made specious excuses and declined. The lecturer, however, less discreet than his reporter, asked how he would classify one who, proclaiming the class-war, votes for capitalist candidates, emphatically pronounced such person a fool. Mr. Burrows should be more careful of his public utterances in Camberwell! *Vive la Commune!*—W.K.

CORRESPONDENCE.

IS THE SOCIALIST PROPAGANDIST NECESSARY?

COMRADES.—In the last *SOCIALIST STANDARD* your correspondent, "Ignoramus," asks for information on three very important points: a clear understanding of which entails a sound grasp of Socialist philosophy. May I offer a slight attempt at explanation?

I have only space enough to deal with one of his points—no doubt those better qualified will deal with the others. With regard to the question of the Taxes the answer is just this: to tax a commodity is by no means necessarily to raise its price, in fact taxation is the least important factor in determining prices. In regard to Municipalism, a variation of the same economic fact is brought to light. Municipal enterprise is favoured by the small middle-class because profits derived therefrom are used to "reduce the Rates"—which Rates again are no factor at all in determining the price of house-accommodation and, therefore, no concern of the working-class as such. Certain Socialists, by-the-way, advocate municipalism chiefly because of this rate-reduction, and it is this use of "Municipalisation" or "Nationalisation" as a red-herring to draw the working-class into the mazes and mists of "Reform" that we must set our faces against as fiercely as against any "Fiscalism" or "Laborism" whatever.

But these points will be dealt with doubtless by the better-qualified. "Ignoramus's" other point needs careful examination. "Here is the rub," he says, "the intelligence of the worker can only expand as a result of the alteration of his present conditions. Yet the alteration of these conditions is dependent upon the expansion of the working-class intelligence. The latter must precede the former, yet the former must precede the latter!" Put in this way it certainly looks like a contradiction, but is not "Ignoramus" generalising a little too loosely?

We find reason to complain that the working-class in general are either satisfied with things as they are or despair of any improvement in their lot. We find them too often caring little for the acquirement of knowledge about anything, and in parts animal in their enjoyments and squalid in their ideals. But will "Ignoramus" or anyone else deny that all this and a 100 per cent. more could be said of the possessing-class? Is not the capitalist-class in general brutal, unenlightened, animal in its pleasures, and squalid in its ideals—and much more so than the average working-man? Are the manners of "Park Lane" so greatly different from the "New Cut" except in outward form?

The average workman fails to realise that the present system is based upon his enslavement. The average member of the "respectable" class considers himself or herself a superior kind of being to a member of the lower orders. Which is the most ignorant? In short, the "ignorance" argument cuts both ways, and, argued to its logical conclusion, simply exposes the hideous mockery of our "glorious Civilisation." That the number of those who really love learning, who ardently seek Truth, or who possess any lofty life ideals is very few, no one who knows anything of Life as it is could deny; but few as they are, I contend and will maintain that their number is made up of actual proletarians and those who work with the proletariat for the Social Revolution.

"Ignoramus" has hardly got the Socialist contention correctly stated. That the hoodlum, the drunkard, the imbecile, the physically degenerate, the libertine, the prostitute, the "gospel revivalist," the blasé rout, and the Society lady are all hideous products of an obsolete social system is what we contend; and when it is argued that the poor are poor because they "drink" or because of their "ignorance," we are easily able to show that they are created what they are by their environment.

Furthermore we are easily able to show that the evils of poverty tend to increase with the development of capitalism. But to contend that the working-class is "ignorant" is to ignore the fact that the whole production of the community is effected by the efforts of wage-labourers. The capitalist as a capitalist contributes not one iota to the useful work of society. The "intel-

lectual" working-man is with us—and suffers from unemployment and the "competition of machinery and women" like the remainder of the working-class. Is a clerk who understands three languages and cannot get employed at any price above 30s. a week to be classed as "ignorant"? He is a proletarian beyond question.

Briefly, the ignorance and apathy of the working-class exists, like that of the capitalist-class, in the shape of "lop-sided" development and is common to our present social system; but this does not prevent the working-man from realising what every day it becomes easier for him to realise, viz., that the present system is based upon his exploitation and enslavement, that his interests and those of the master-class are diametrically opposed, that therefore the master-class will always consciously or unconsciously try to keep him as he is, and consequently that he must act in such wise as to get rid of a master-class at once and for ever.

The function of the Socialist propagandist is to speedily and effectively increase the opportunities for this awakening. The Socialist is produced by present conditions just as much as anything else, and most of all, "Ignoramus," it only needs ordinary common sense to understand Socialism—otherwise, Comrades Editorial, where should I have been?—Yours fraternally, THOS. A. JACKSON.

MUNICIPALISM.

The Editors of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

May I be permitted, in reference to the query of "Ignoramus" in your last issue, to offer the following remarks on this subject.

When we consider the large number of examples of what the man in the street terms "Municipal Socialism," it is well that we should explain our position on the subject and thus prevent further confusion—at least, amongst our readers. The action of municipalities in undertaking certain industries is not so much from a desire on their part to benefit the workers in those industries as it is from a wish to obtain cheaper or better services than would be supplied by the ordinary capitalist. It is only when things reach a point where the middle-class in a locality think they are not having their requirements met in a sufficiently economical manner that we hear the cry for municipalism—mis-called municipal Socialism.

As a rule the result is that these municipal enterprises are—from a capitalist point of view—fairly successful. The L.C.C. tramcars, the Nottingham municipal enterprises, and others—too numerous to specify—have made large profits which have been used in relief of the rates. This is a direct gain to the middle-class ratepayers. Take another side of the question. Take the municipal electric lighting or gas supply. In a town containing a large number of large shops and factories a large quantity of gas or electric light is consumed. It can readily be seen that, in such a case, a small reduction in price per unit or thousand feet will make quite a difference to the quarterly bill of a large consumer, whereas to the worker, who has at most but a few jets or lamps, the difference is so trifling as to be hardly appreciable. Municipalism even if undertaken with the intention to benefit the worker could do but little. Its sphere is so limited and the local bodies are always under the control of the central governing authority which strictly limits its operations. Municipalism can only be tolerated by Socialists when viewed as examples of collective ownership. It is one of the technical means which class-conscious workers can, when in control, use in a limited manner to benefit themselves. While there are profits workers are being robbed of the results of their labour. This operates just the same whether caused by individual or collective capitalists. The operation of trusts on the one hand and municipalism on the other will cause all industries to become monopolies. The monopolies will, in their turn, be nationalised when it is to the interests of the capitalist-class to protect themselves from the encroachments of the financial magnates. Thus so-called State Socialism will be brought into being. A superb State and Municipal organised robbery of the workers. It is our duty to teach the workers what production for profit and class-ownership really mean—to point out the Social

Revolution that is necessary and that The Socialist Party of Great Britain is the working-class party of that Revolution.—E.J.B.A.

AN APPEAL FROM RUSSIA.

In accordance with the invitation of the International Socialist Bureau we publish the following correspondence. Any moneys received in response thereto will be at once forwarded to the Bureau. Remittances should be sent to C. Lehane, General Secretary, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 107, Charlotte St., London, W.

International Socialist Bureau,
Maison du Peuple, Brussels.
18.2.05.

Dear Citizen,

We have just received a letter from Citizen Roubanovitch, and we hasten to transmit to you the enclosed copy.

We place ourselves entirely at your disposal for the distribution of the sums collected.

We would ask you to bring the matter under the notice of the Socialist press of your country in which subscription lists have not yet been opened, in order that they may be enabled to answer the appeal of our Russian comrades fighting for the common cause of the International proletariat.

Fraternal greetings,
(signed) Cam. Huysmans,
Secretary.

To the Secretary,
The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

(Enclosure.) 50, rue Lhomond,
Paris (5).
16.2.1905.

Dear Comrades,

Subscriptions are being collected in all countries by the Socialist press on behalf of the Russian Socialists to aid the revolutionary movement or render assistance to the strikers and their families.

I have just been notified by the Central Committee of the Russian Revolutionary Socialist Party, of which I am the delegate to the International Socialist Bureau, that at the present time funds are very urgently required.

I therefore ask you to kindly take the initiative in appealing to the various Socialist Parties and newspapers, requesting them to remit the amounts collected to the International Socialist Bureau, which will distribute the funds between the Russian and Polish Parties in accordance with an arrangement which can easily be come to by the common consent of the Russian and Polish delegates.

Very fraternally yours,
E. Roubanovitch.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
Peckham Branch.
Feb. 14, 1905.

To the Editorial Committee,
THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Comrades.—My comrades in Peckham request me to convey to you their warm appreciation and approval of the general tone and get-up of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, and trust that the same may continue.

Yours in the Cause,
WALTER WREN, Secretary.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

E.J.B.A. (Fulham).—Kindly note that articles intended for publication should be written on only one side of the paper.

W.W. (Pembroke Dock).—Thanks for good wishes.
F.C.H. (Rochester).—The final paragraph in the Declaration of Principles of The Socialist Party of Great Britain proceeds from the position laid down in the previous paragraphs. To explain the final clause in the Declaration would involve going over the ground already covered in the first seven articles thereof. If you will carefully study the document in its entirety you will find your difficulties vanish. If not, we will try and make any point clear. But study the Declaration.

J.G. (Oxford).—Thanks. Any information you may require will be gladly supplied.

TALKS IN THE TRAIN.

"Good morning, John."
"Good morning, William, what do you think of the King's Speech?"
"I am pleased to see that the Government intends to deal with the question of the unemployed!"

"To 'deal' with it?"
"Yes, 'legislation will be submitted to you for the establishment of authorities to deal with the unemployed'!"
"And you really think the Conservatives will 'deal' with it?"

"Is there any reason to doubt it?"
"Yes, the capitalist system, which the House of Commons is elected to support, produces an unemployed problem. If that problem were effectively 'dealt' with it would mean the abolition of the capitalist system, and that, as you know, is not 'practical politics.'"

"But, surely you will give the Government credit for good intentions?"
"It is said that the road to Hell is already well-paved with such. Apart from that, both Conservative and Liberal leaders have declared their inability to do anything."

"When did they make those declarations?"

"Speaking at Watford, in October, 1895, the late Lord Salisbury said 'we have got as far as we can to make this country more pleasant to live in for the vast majority of those who inhabit it' and 'we have no panacea for the evils with which we are afflicted.' In the following November, at Brighton, he said 'I am conscious that when the Government has done its best, this would advance but a very small distance in diminishing the suffering which the hand of Providence has inflicted.'"

"But what about Balfour? He is leader now."
"Yes, and at Manchester, in January, 1895, he said 'If you ask me whether anything in the power of the Unionist Party or any other party or within the compass of the wit of man to devise can meet the curse of lack of employment, I fear we can look forward to no prospect of that kind.' He no doubt holds the same opinion now."

"Then we must turn to the Liberals!"
"Who will give you no better encouragement. In the House of Commons, in February, 1895, Sir William Harcourt said that with regard to the question of the unemployed, he agreed with the position taken up by Mr. Balfour a few days previously at Manchester. Of Asquith, who was responsible for the murder of the Featherstone miners, a cynical indifference could only be expected. At Newcastle, in January, 1895, he referred to the unemployed as the nation's 'rub-bish!' And when Campbell Bannerman was asked by the unemployed deputation at Poplar in January last what he would propose as a means of dealing with the problem he merely said he 'was not in the Government.'"

"But, then, admitting the futility of expecting that either Conservatives or Liberals will solve the problem, I think that the promised legislation on the alien question will help."

"In what way?"
"Well, if aliens come over here and drive our own men away and deprive them of work, don't you think the Government should prohibit alien immigration?"

"You and I are clerks. A few years ago all clerks were males. But women have entered the field against us. In many departments they have not only lowered men's wages, but have driven out male labour altogether. Would you ask the Government to prohibit women and girls entering into competition with clerks and other workmen?"

"Ah! but then they are our own flesh and blood; the others are foreigners."

"But the effect is the same!"

"Still, we must look after our own flesh and blood."

"Is it the rule of the employers to consider 'flesh and blood,' or are they not usually willing to employ any person, irrespective of nationality or creed, who will answer their purpose?"

"But if the aliens were kept out things would be better."

"I cannot see it. The unemployed problem confronts us because of the increasing power of

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

producing wealth which man, aided by machinery, is securing, a power which is increased every day by the improvement of old methods and machines, and the introduction of new. This would continue, even if we had no aliens. All that is urged against these victims of "man's inhumanity to man" could be met by strict enforcement of the Sanitary and Housing Acts, and by the enactment of laws fixing a maximum working week and a minimum wage, equal for both sexes when equal work is done."

"Isn't that a big order?"

"Not if the alien problem is as important as you urge."

"You say that even if all aliens were excluded we should still have an unemployed problem. In that case we have our colonies."

"Where you already have an unemployed problem."

"But not so intense as here."

"But you propose to make it so by sending more men to them."

"Ah! but that's where Chamberlain's scheme comes in. Give our colonies more of our trade."

"That might help for a time; but do not forget there is no cessation of the development of the machine industry, in your colonies as elsewhere. In the near future your colonies will be manufacturing all that they require, and will not then need manufactured goods from

Britain. They will be independent of us, as the Continental nations have become. Moreover, by giving your trade to your colonies you take it away from other countries and intensify the unemployed problem in those."

"Oh, that's their business."

"You admit, then, that these proposals cannot solve the problem, that at the best they would merely improve matters in some parts of the world, and make things worse in others."

"I quite see now that the problem is an international one."

"And can only be solved by international action on the part of the wealth-producers. The present demands of the unemployed are unsound."

"In what way?"

"They are asking for 'work' when already far too much 'work' is done. What is required is something which involves a change in the basis and organisation of society—the redistribution of work."

"The redistribution of work!"

"Yes. Let everybody work. Let each do his share of the work before enjoying any of the results of labour."

"Why, that means—"

"ALL CHANGE!"

CORNER SEAT.

THE POWER TO GENERALISE.

WHEN one realises the tremendous waste of force that results from inability or neglect to survey the social problem from a detached point of view, the importance of urging the necessity for the development of the power to generalise becomes apparent. On every hand we see reformers directing their efforts toward the remedy, or what they conceive to be the remedy, for the particular evil that appeals to them, and yet failing to recognise that these evils are but the outcome of a common cause for the reason that they have never, so to say, been able to get outside their subject and regard it from the broad point of view that is absolutely essential to its proper understanding, and that would enable them to see its connection with, and dependency upon, the basic fact underlying all the evils of the modern form of society, including the pet evils of our particular reformer: the fact of the private ownership of the means of life.

It is easily understood why the intellectual vision of the worker should be limited, when the detailed condition of his labour is realised. The subdivision of labour has been carried to such an extent that the outlook of the worker is largely limited to his own particular branch of industry; but such an individual must climb out of his rut and view the situation generally to understand the position. He must leave his position as a cog in a wheel of a complicated machine, and seek to get over the machine itself and see it running to be able to understand the part he plays there, far less to fully comprehend the total economy of the machine.

When a man views a picture he steps back until he can see the whole picture at once, thus getting a general view. He can then understand the true relation of the parts, the bearing one part has to another part and to the whole, which would be impossible without taking such a general view. If he were to look never so closely at first one part and then another over the whole picture, he would have a very confused idea of the subject of the picture, and would be unable to appreciate the details. The same thing applies to the social problem. If that man were to view the social problem part by part over the whole area he would have as confused a conception of the problem as the art critic would have of that picture. When he draws back and views the whole question he understands the importance, the relation, and the value of the details, but such an understanding is impossible until he has taken such general view. And it seems that it is this inability to generalise that makes the lopsided, ill-balanced cranks, whose inconsistent actions so tend to discredit the movement and play into the hands of the enemies of Socialism.

It is only by taking up this detached point of view that we can get a general view of modern society and its twentieth century poverty problem, for it has become a truism that the onlooker sees more of the game than the player. The deep and wide division between the classes will be more obvious, and the gross injustice of modern society will force itself upon the observer. To realise one class, consisting of millions of men, women, and children existing now whose sole function seems to be to work, while the result of all their labour is poverty and misery and want; while the other class live an idle life of luxury and pleasure. When the poverty of the wealth-producer and the wealth of the non-producer are seen together the extraordinary contradiction of capitalism will be recognised.

The fads of the social reformers will then appear in a new light. The temperance problem, the housing problem, the unemployed problem, and the hundred and one problems that arise from the fundamental economic problem will appear as parts of the whole; and their connection with, their dependence on, and their relation to the whole social problem will make plain to the investigator the futility of an attack on any of these special problems. We know that such efforts can come to nothing, simply because of the neglect to comprehend the whole problem, the connection and inter-connection of the parts, and, more important

still, the common parent of all the evils that the one-sided reformers seek to remedy. Until they realise that the whole of the evils that modern society suffers under are traceable, ultimately, to the basic factor, the economic conditions of society, they will continue to waste their time and energy through an incomplete comprehension of the whole social problem, which can only be obtained by making good use of the Power to Generalise.
DICK KERT.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Branches and members should purchase their literature through the Party Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W. Write for particulars as to terms, etc.

CENTRAL ECONOMIC CLASS.

The class meets weekly and is free to all. On application to J. Fitzgerald, 34, Wilmington Square, London, W.C., full particulars will be sent.

PECKHAM BRANCH, The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

ON
SUNDAY, MARCH 12th, 1905, at 7 p.m.
Mr. B. Philpott Wright

WILL OPEN A DISCUSSION ON
"ENVIRONMENT"
(Analysis of its Causes.)

Special invitation to all interested in
this important subject.

NOTE ADDRESS:
33, HIGH ST., PECKHAM.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
BATTERSEA BRANCH.

A Grand Bazaar

Will be held at
SYDNEY HALL,
York Road, Battersea.
On **SATURDAY, APRIL 22nd,**
MONDAY, 24th, and
TUESDAY 25th.

All able to assist in any way should
communicate immediately with
A. JONES, 4, Matthew Street,
Latchmere Estate, Battersea.

S.P.G.B.

A REUNION.
Of London Members and Friends

WILL BE HELD AT THE
RAINBOW HOTEL, NEWGATE ST.,
ON
SATURDAY, 18th MARCH,
AT 7 P.M.
ADMISSION FREE.

Branch Secretaries and others
SHOULD NOTE THAT
JACOMB BROS.
Can do their printing as Cheaply and as
well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

CENTRAL OFFICE:
COMMUNIST CLUB,
107, CHARLOTTE ST., LONDON, W.
General Secretary C. LEHANE.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 8, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.
CENTRAL.—Business transacted every Saturday at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W. Membership in the Central Branch can be obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.
CLERKENWELL.—Kate Hawkins, sec., 47, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmington Square, W.C.
EAST LONDON (Central).—G. Fletcher, Sec., 305, Wilmott Street, Bethnal Green, E. Branch meets every Friday at the Secretary's address.
EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 34, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.
FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 40, Mablethorpe Rd., Fulham Cross, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m.
ISLINGTON.—Padraig Ua Toibin, Secretary, 112, Fonthill Road, Finsbury Park, N. Branch meets every 2nd and 4th Tuesday of the month at 8.30 p.m. at the "Hope Coffee Tavern," 112, Fonthill Road, Finsbury Park, N.
PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.
PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.
ROMFORD DIVISION.—J. Kent, Secretary, 5, Rutland Road, Ilford. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Fridays in each month at 8.30 at secretary's address.
TOOTING.—C. Goss, Secretary, 78, Balham Grove, Balham, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at 61, Glasford Street, Tooting.
TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.
WATFORD.—D. R. Newlands, Sec., 5, Highfield Rd., Bushey, Herts. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays in month, Economic Class 2nd and 4th Sunday, at 16, Merton Rd., Watford, at 3 p.m.
WEST HAM.—G. J. Hodson, Secretary, 'Kelmecott,' Sidney Road, Forest Gate, E. Branch meets every alternate Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at the address given.
WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

SYDNEY HALL

38, YORK ROAD,
BATTERSEA, S.W.
Sunday Night Lectures.

The following Lectures will be delivered at the above hall during March:

March 5: A. ANDERSON.
Subject: THE CURSE of COMPROMISE.
March 12: E. J. B. ALLEN.
Subject: SOCIALISM & EVOLUTION.
March 19: F. C. WATTS, A. ANDERSON, C. LEHANE, H. NEUMANN, & J. FITZGERALD.

Special Meeting: THE PARIS COMMUNE.
March 26: H. BELSEY.
Subject: LITERATURE.
April 2: R. KENNY.
Subject: SOCIALISM & TRADE UNIONISM.

TIME 7 p.m. ADMISSION FREE.
ALL WORKERS INVITED.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 8. Vol. I.]

LONDON, APRIL, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

ENQUIRIES INVITED.

BRANCHES WANTED IN EVERY
TOWN IN GREAT BRITAIN.

WHO CAN BOSS?

ROOSEVELT will fight the Trusts! So were the American people in particular and the civilized world in general told when he was put in power. Such of the American people as had knowledge smiled, if they did not, they should have done. The Beef Trust was impeached, and found guilty of conspiracy to fix prices, secure illegal rebates from the railroads, and stifle free competition. The United States Circuit Court of Illinois granted an injunction against the Trust on the foregoing counts. But the Trust did not worry—it simply continued in the same old way. On the 31st of January, 1905, the newspapers stated their belief that criminal proceedings would be taken against the firms constituting the Trust. Speaking on the following day at Philadelphia, Mr. Roosevelt urged, among other things, more federal control of commerce and particularly of railroads. "Neither this people nor any other free people," he declared, "will permanently tolerate vast power conferred by vast wealth in a corporate form, that does not lodge somewhere in the Government a still higher power of seeing that this power is used for and not against the people as a whole." In New York, on the same day, a railroad Trust, believed in financial circles to be the largest of its kind, was brought into existence. Mr. W. H. Newman, president of the New York Central Line, was appointed president of the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis lines, popularly known as the "big four." This combination consists of nearly thirty distinct lines, and controls all the great routes from New York to Chicago, with the exception of the Pennsylvania railway. The final aim of the Trust is to make practically one system from the Atlantic to the Pacific and to form one huge combination with a capital of seven billion dollars (£1,400,000,000). On the following day a Cotton Trust was formed, with a capital of a hundred million dollars (£20,000,000). It comprises almost all the mills in Massachusetts and some in the other New England States. The reason given for its formation was that the northern mills could not compete with the southern and they had to amalgamate in order to exist. The paragraph significantly concludes thus: "The new Trust proposes to reorganise the business of the mills it takes over, on the basis of economical production and new processes of weaving. There will be economies effected in the labour and management of the mills." Thus the Trusts show their contempt for the powers that be. Not a President goes to the White House without their permission. As Mr. William Allen White points out in the New York "Collier's," "The people howl for Roosevelt and whoop it up for reform, until the railroads begin issuing passes and contributing to the campaign fund. Then these same dear patriotic people get in special trains, eat free railroad grub, corrode their insides with free railroad liquor, and hurrah for 'the old man,' who sees the railroads run the government."

But, says the Britisher, this is all in America and it does not follow that similar things occur or could occur in England. We have no such Trusts. Let us see. On January 30th of this year, news was published of the amalgamation of two most important cotton-spinning associations. Between them they controlled over

30,000,000 spindles, out of England's total of 45,000,000, the world's total being 110,000,000. In October, 1904, the Scottish and North of England Iron and Steel Masters met and arrived at an understanding, the result of which was very soon shewn in a reduction of the wages of the employees of the firms concerned. Recently the Cornish producers of china formed themselves into an Association. Even the capitalist papers refer to the London Coal Trade as "the Coal ring," whilst that of the Billingsgate Fish merchants is well-known. The American invasion to capture the Tobacco trade taught the English manufacturers that the only way that they could fight a Trust was by forming another and the Imperial Tobacco Company was the result. The Liquor monopoly is of course a Trust, the strength of which is largely due to the policy pursued by the lopsided "Temperance" reformers. At the present moment, the "one-man grocer" as he is called, is much agitated about the statement that the Mazawattee Tea Co. is about to open 300 to 400 shops in the country for the retailing of its tea and other commodities, but it is no trade secret that the vast proportion of the retail grocery shops belong to similar mammoth concerns. The provision shops, too, are often merely distributive depôts for the wholesale houses, whilst few of the "master" bakers are other than managers for, or "tied" tenants of, the millers. Then we have the Wall-Paper Trust, the Type-Writer Trust, and so on. Here, as abroad, industry after industry becomes trustified. The only way in which the capitalists of any country can hope to secure and maintain a hold upon the World's Markets is by these large combinations of capital, with their resulting more systematic methods of organisation and "effective economies in labour and management."

This ever extending growth of the Trusts means a more and more precarious existence for the workers. The ever-improving machinery that these large capitals can operate should prove to the workers that they have no effective weapon with which to fight them and resist their aggressions. The Trade Unions with their few thousands of pounds cannot hope to successfully fight the Trusts with their millions. The power of the machine alone will almost crush them, but the machine and the large capital combined in the Trust they cannot fight. The lesson of the class war must be brought home to them. Just as in the United States the capitalist papers admit the control of the Government by the Trusts, so will it happen here in England. The only way of salvation for the workers lies in the transformation of these Trusts into national property and the organisation of industry on a co-operative basis of production for use and not for profit. No capitalist party will legislate for this—they dare not, on the pain of self-extinction. The only party that dare go to the legislative assemblies to do this is the Socialist working-class, organised on the lines of the class war, with its tactics and policy in accord with its principle, with a clear knowledge of the fact that rent, profit, and interest exist because the workers—the wealth-creators—are robbed of the wealth they produce, whether taken from them by private capitalists or by the capitalist state or municipality. A revolutionary Socialist party alone can act in the real interests of the workers, and for the workers of this country that party is The Socialist Party of Great Britain.—E. J. B. ALLEN.

A LOOK ROUND.

"No doubt," says a correspondent, "you have readers who are interested in the affairs of Messrs. Kidd, McAllen, Barnes, Curran, &c., but for me they are unimportant." Well, much depends upon the point of view, and from ours they are very important.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is not issued with the object of providing a livelihood for professional journalists, or to boom certain persons who think, rightly or wrongly, that good will result if, by becoming Councillors or M.P.s, they can enhance their reputations as "leaders" of the working-class. It would be easier, and doubtless produce better financial results, for the conductors to devote the paper to cycling, theatrical and anti-theological matters, with Socialism as a side-line. But it is the official organ of a militant Socialist Party, not existing to induce folks to believe in Socialism as a "pious opinion" but as a necessary and desirable revolution which they shall organise to accomplish. The Party holds very definite views as to the tactics of the Socialist Army and was founded because these tactics were not being pursued by any existing body.

In promulgating their views concerning the establishment of the Socialist Republic and the basis of organisation of the Socialist working-class, the members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain are inevitably brought into conflict with other bodies claiming to be Socialist as well as with capitalist politicians. It is necessary to show how not to do it, as well as how to do it. It is claimed that the L.R.C., S.D.F., and I.L.P., are examples of how not to do it, and it is therefore necessary to criticise and to oppose them, quite as much as the orthodox politicians. In this connection, however the aim has always been to be as vigorous and as critical as circumstances demand, but not caustic or abusive.

A case in point. Class-conscious Socialists must oppose capitalist candidates because the latter stand for Capitalism as against Socialism, for the perpetuation of the class war by the perpetuation of classes, for the interests of the exploiters as against those of the exploited. These reasons should always be stated on the platform and in the press. Yet only last month, at a meeting called to promote the candidature of Major Jameson for South West Ham, Councillor Davis (I.L.P.) moved, and Councillor J. Jones (S.D.F.) seconded an amendment declaring that because Major Jameson had been indifferent to his Parliamentary duties during the present Parliament, and knowing that he was elected for West Clare as an Irish Nationalist and had now changed his politics, he was not a fit and proper person to represent South West Ham. Now the reasons given here might be good ones from the point of view of one set of capitalist politicians opposing another, but they are not Socialist reasons. The policy here pursued was not a "straight" one; the tactics were those of suppression and confusion.

It is easy to multiply instances of the contradictory and confusing tactics of the S.D.F. W. C. Steadman is the London Trades Council and Liberal candidate for Central Finsbury, vice-president of the Central Finsbury Liberal Association, president of the Stepney Liberal, Radical, Labour, and Progressive Association, and Progressive member of the L.C.C. for Stepney. At the February meeting of the London Trades Council, presided over by H. Quelch (editor of *Justice*) the question of Steadman's refusal to sign the L.R.C. constitution was raised, and Quelch pointed out that it had been understood all through that Steadman had the support of the L.T.C. His failure to conform to the rules of any other body made no difference to their attitude. They supported him before the L.R.C. was formed. Now, not only the chairman, but the secretary, and also very many of the delegates to the L.T.C. are members of the S.D.F. They are supporting Steadman, although in *Justice* for May 22nd,

1897, H. Quelch wrote: "The non-Socialist trade-unionist is the type of labour representative which is fashionable in the House of Commons and in other representative assemblies in the kingdom. We had better have none at all. Flunkies and sycophants, they ape the airs of their masters, while they condemn and misrepresent the class in whose name they claim to speak"; and in the same paper a fortnight ago Steadman was described as a "Liberal decoy-duck." Undoubtedly he is, and as such is supported by the S.D.F.

"Is it true that Lady Warwick has become a Socialist?" asks a comrade in Bulgaria, on a postcard written in Esperanto. The long reply which has been sent to him in the same language will give him an up-to-date idea of the condition of the Socialist movement in this country. According to her ladyship's own statement she is now a "proud and convinced member of the S.D.F.," but it does not follow that she is therefore a Socialist. To a representative of the *Daily Chronicle* she quoted details of the S.D.F. programme with which she is "wholly in agreement," but it is not at all necessary to be a Socialist to agree with the items to which she refers. Moreover, she takes exception to the abolition of the monarchy, and it is quite evident that she has still a very great regard for the pomps and vanities connected therewith. To believe in the establishment of the Socialist Republic and object to the abolition of the monarchy is like endeavouring to make the Socialist omelet without breaking the capitalist egg.

One wonders what is the real significance of the booming of the Countess of Warwick in the capitalist press, especially since the banquet to "Labour" M.P.s and candidates at which she told of her "little scheme." "I have been saving up my money," she said "for ever so long, and I have bought a forty h.p. motor car to be at your service. It is to be painted red and some of us are going in it to visit every constituency for which a Labour candidate stands, from John O'Groats to Land's End. We shall leave no stone unturned, when the great struggle comes, as come it will very soon, to put Labour members into Parliament." The italics are ours; so put because of the obvious attempt by "H. W. L." in *Justice* to lead us to suppose that this is not the object of the tour.

Whether she understands Socialism or not, it is apparent that the Countess does not intend to "come out from among" that Society which "either bores or is bored." "There are few sights more impressive," says *Vanity Fair*, "than the entrance of the King and Queen into the House of Lords on the opening day. . . Lady Warwick was in vivid green, with her hair dressed in high Empire curls, which showed above her crown of emeralds and diamonds." From the same journal we learn that "the Quorn had a great day on Friday. . . The meet was at Melton Mowbray, in the Countess of Wilton's grounds." Besides the Countess of Warwick, there were present Dukes and Duchesses, Earls and Countesses, Lords and Ladies, Baronets, and even a Marquess and a Prince. We must confess that the presence of an "avowed Socialist" at such functions as these is distasteful to us because they are outward and visible signs of the domination and degradation of the wealth-creators by the monopolists and their parasites.

No report of the Countess's dinner to "labour" candidates appeared in *Justice*, although the editor himself was present!

Speaking of motor-cars, what has become of "Tattler's" crusade against these, "infernal machines invented by the classes for the purpose of maiming and killing the masses"?

Some branches of the I.L.P. wish to incorporate the word "Socialist" in its title. London City, diplomatic and probably inspired, wish the N.A.C. to report upon the matter at the 1906 Conference. This is the Royal Commission method. Derby would like the name to be "The Socialist Party." The Socialist Party of

Great Britain would be imitated and ought to feel flattered. With Shakespeare we can say: "Who steals my purse steals trash." As ours is the straight Socialist Party, the man with the bag is not weighed down by its ponderosity. But when it is suggested that the I.L.P. should "annex" our good name, we must protest; although we do not anticipate that the proposal will receive much support. The leaders, at any rate, prefer to keep their Socialism in the background, or to confuse it with references to Christianity and Labourism, or like the S.D.F., to support its enemies. A party must be judged by its actions, and these have proved that the I.L.P. is the enemy of uncompromising Socialism.

A Walthamstow comrade, who finds it exceedingly interesting and instructive to read back numbers of *Justice* and compare them with present issues expresses his surprise at the very great change that has taken place. He says that in September, 1894, the leading article declared that the object of the I.L.P., in common with that of other working-class organisations, whether they had accepted collectivist theories or not, was to secure better rations for the wage-slave, but that that was not the object of the S.D.F., which was striving for the abolition of wagedom. Seeing that the energies of the S.D.F. are now devoted to the advocacy of two palliatives, viz., relief works for the unemployed and free meals for the wage-slaves that are to be, he asks what has become of the object of 1894. As we have so often pointed out, the S.D.F. has ceased to be a revolutionary body, and is now a mere reform society, like the I.L.P. and other bodies which it so freely criticises and condemns.

This comrade calls to mind the condemnation of Tom Mann which appeared in *Justice* in June, 1896, for allowing a joint committee to delete from his election address the words: "I am a Socialist," and otherwise modifying and moderating it. He questions the official announcement that the Walthamstow branch of the S.D.F. are running G. Bailey for the District Council, because the Walthamstow Trades and Labour Council are running him with others as pure and simple "Labour" candidates. In support of this he forwards a copy of Bailey's election address. It is true that on the front page the candidate is described as of the "Navvies' Union and S.D.F.," but in much larger type the candidates are referred to on the same page as "the only Labour Candidates selected by the Walthamstow Trades and Labour Council." The address itself contains no statement of the principles of Socialism and no reference thereto. It speaks of the "need of independent labour representation." One item of the education section is purely individualistic and the whole of the programme could be subscribed to by any municipal "reformer." In conclusion it is signed by the candidates for all the wards, and even the letters "S.D.F." have been omitted from Bailey's name, who is simply "Secretary, Navvies' Union." And our correspondent again refers to *Justice* of June, 1896, which stated that it was of no consequence at all to get Socialists elected unless they were elected as Socialists. That, of course, was and is the sound position. All that has changed is the policy of the S.D.F. It was because of this change that many of us, convinced that the intransigent, uncompromising policy is the only sound and honest one, were compelled to resign our many-years' membership of the S.D.F. "The policy of 'no compromise' must necessarily be defeated again and again before it wins. But when it does win it wins unconditionally, and is unhampered by restrictions, arrangements, or intrigues." That holds good as much to-day as when it was written, in the name of the S.D.F., nearly twelve years ago; and in this country those who, having accepted the principles of Socialism, agree with the policy of "No Compromise," agree with Wilhelm Liebknecht that "the separation of the Socialists from all other parties, this essential difference which silly opponents take as a reason or pretext for declaring us political outlaws, is our pride and our strength," should join the only party which is organised upon these lines, The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

J. KAY.

SOCIALISTS & CAPITALIST HOSPITALS.

Why "capitalist" hospitals? The non-Socialist will ask. Because the diseases and injuries there treated are caused, almost entirely by the unhealthy conditions of life of the workers, imposed upon them by the capitalist system, or negligence of the employers to provide accident preventing appliances. Because, also, as consistent Socialists have always pointed out, the patients, mostly of the working-class, are used to experiment on for the benefit of the propertied class.

"The hospitals, it should be remembered, are the training schools of the medical profession," wrote London's Lord Mayor in 1899, "and for that reason deserve grateful recognition and adequate support." The treatment meted out to the "subjects" is detailed by a medical practitioner in the *Grand Magazine* in the course of which he declares that although medical students must learn their business, patients also have rights—but the poorer class of these, especially women, are treated as if they were destitute of human feeling. He asserts that in every hospital recognised by the Medical Council as a place of instruction for students the treatment of the patients is entirely subordinated to the instruction of those students and that it may be said with perfect truth that the girls and young women who attend the public hospitals gain the possible healing of their bodies at the expense of mortal injury to their souls. What, he asks, must be the moral effect on a modest girl who goes to a hospital complaining of some trivial ailment, and is stripped naked to the waist, and subjected to the salacious scrutiny of some dozens of youths who lay hands on her and maul her about to their hearts' content? It is immaterial whether she complains of or has anything the matter with her chest or not. She, in common with her sisters in misfortune, is utilised as "material" for the instruction of students. At one time he saw 14 young women of ages from 12 to 25, all standing stripped in this manner. One girl, aged 18, told him she had been attending the hospital nearly every fortnight for over three years. Imagine how much modesty would be left in her after exhibiting herself in this fashion for years to many hundreds of students. There was not the slightest hope of cure or improvement, so that this girl was regularly exposed in this manner merely because she was an "interesting case." Eighteen months ago he was the unwilling witness of an even greater atrocity. A woman was dying of malignant disease of the stomach, and the physician under whose "care" she was was delivering a clinical lecture, taking the unhappy woman as his text. In the course of his remarks he mentioned various ways of ascertaining the extent of the stomach, amongst them the method of inflating it with gas, and then by percussion mapping out its boundaries. A student inquired precisely how it was done, and the physician said he would show him. The patient was thereupon given a solution of bicarbonate of soda, and this dose was immediately followed by one of tartaric acid. The effect on the poor woman was pitiful, as one can readily understand, for the stomach was instantly distended enormously, which would have been extremely painful had it been healthy; how much more so when eaten out with cancer? She was hours recovering from the effect of this unnecessary experiment, and she died the next day. Is it fair, or just, or even reasonable that, in addition to the pain and worry of her disease, a young woman should be compelled to sacrifice her modesty by stripping herself to the gaze and handling of dozens of men? No medical man would dream of treating a private patient in such an unseemly manner. Why, then, should advantage be taken of the poverty of less fortunate women?

Of course, there is nothing new in all this. Such practices have assisted Socialists in their opposition to attempts to persuade the workers to contribute to hospital funds, or to take part in friendly society, trades union and other like parades, and street collections. Moreover, the voting of subsidies by public bodies has, until recently been strenuously resisted. We know that this attitude is unpopular, because the workers have been bamboozled into believing that the

hospitals exist for their benefit, but it is none the less the correct one for the Socialist, who sees in the failure of the capitalist-class to support them, an opportunity for the people to provide, own and control such places in the interest of and for the benefit of all.

In view of recent developments, it would be too much to expect S.D.F. members and other "labour" representatives to support such a vote-spoiling, "inopportune" attitude. On the contrary, they must "use every means" to get and keep seats. We seldom hear of the anti-hospital Sunday demonstrations we knew in the old days. We do occasionally hear of so-called Socialist councillors and other elected persons appearing at dinners organised for the purpose of raising funds for hospitals and learning to use the tooth-pick with the best of them. But it is left to an S.D.F. councillor of West Ham to propose an express speed down-hill policy in this connection by placing the following resolution upon the agenda for a recent meeting of Council. "Councillor Hayday will move: 'That the Council do approach the trustees of the West Ham hospital for the purpose of entering into an arrangement by which upon payment by the Council to the trustees of the annual sum of £1,000 the latter will, from time to time, receive into the hospital such number of sick inhabitants as may be nominated by the Council.'" As we have seen no report of its being discussed or voted upon we presume it has not been reached and stands postponed. Meanwhile the West Ham branch of The Socialist Party of Great Britain have sent a letter of protest to the Council, setting forth their reasons, and we trust their action will prevent public funds being voted to private institutions where the bodies of the working-class are utilized as experimental objects for the benefit of the rich.—W.

OUR RE-UNION.

THE Re-union of members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to celebrate the anniversary of the Paris Commune was held on Saturday, March 18th, 1905, at the "Rainbow Hotel," Newgate Street, E.C. At 7 o'clock the members began to gather in goodly numbers, and it was soon seen that they were not only bent upon having an enjoyable evening, but that they meant that this, the first Re-union of members, should be a notable success. This was also anticipated by the organisers of the gathering who had provided a splendid programme of musical and elocutionary talent. Comrades Kent and Fitzgerald were expected to preside during the evening, but pending their arrival the chair was taken by Comrade Crump, who opened the proceedings. He vacated the chair on the arrival of Comrade Kent, who delivered the usual chairman's speech. Amongst those who so splendidly contributed to the evening's entertainment were: the Misses Beale, Mrs. Newlands, H. Young, D. Newlands, E. Farebrother, T. Tarrant, H. Belsey, F. S. Leigh, T. A. Jackson. We also had a stirring address from Comrade Anderson, and the meeting terminated by singing the "International," and with cheers for the Social Revolution and for The Socialist Party of Great Britain. Over a hundred of the members of our party were present and they fully expressed the opinion that the success of the re-union would more than justify the holding of many similar functions in the near future.—O.C.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Branches and members should purchase their literature through the Party Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W. Write for particulars as to terms, etc.

CENTRAL ECONOMIC CLASS.

The class meets weekly and is free to all. On application to J. Fitzgerald, 34, Wilmington Square, London, W.C., full particulars will be sent.

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

PROPERTY AND CRIME.

NEARLY our whole criminal code is made up of what may be called property crimes. The jails and penitentiaries of the world are filled to overflowing with men and women who have been charged with committing crimes against property. But where is the property that has been the subject of these dire assaults? No matter where you turn your eyes in the world, the whole property is in the hands of a chosen few, and the so-called owners of all this wealth—created by the labour of man and the bounty of nature—these so-called owners have committed no crime against property. The statement of the fact is sufficient to show the inequality of the whole system under which the fruits of the earth are kept in the possession of the few.

As a consequence of his desire for life and the means that make it certain and pleasant, man has ever turned his attention to the conquest of nature, reducing vegetable and animal life to his control. But his conquest does not end here. Ever has man enslaved his fellow: he has sought to make his own career upon earth pleasanter and more certain by compelling others to toil for him. In its more primitive stages slavery was enforced by the ownership of the man. In its later and more refined stages it is carried on by the ownership of the things from which man must live. The rulers no longer have the right to buy and sell the man, to send him here and there to suit their will. They simply have the power to dictate the terms upon which he can stand upon the earth. With the mines, the forests, the oil, the harbors, the railroads, and the really valuable productive land in the rulers' hands, the dominance and power of man over his fellows is absolute and complete.

The rulers make penal codes for the regulation and control of the earth and all the property thereon. Not only do they make these rules for their brief, haughty lives, but they provide that it may pass from hand to hand for ever. The generations now living, or rather those that are dead and gone, fixed the status of unborn millions, and decreed that they shall have no place to live except upon such terms as may be dictated by those who then controlled the earth. To retain all the means of life in the hands of the few and compel the many to do service to support these few requires the machinery of the state. It is for this that penal laws are made.

The criminal statutes forbid extortion and swindling, and yet the largest part of business is extortion, and much of the balance is swindling. Real extortion is taking for any service more than it is fairly worth by means of agencies created by the extorter to despoil his victim and this is the business of the business world. . . The law forbids swindling, at least in certain ways, and yet a large part of business consists in making the public believe that they are getting more value for what they give than the tradesman can possibly afford. . . All our merchants and tradesmen frantically call out their lies in every form, that they may sell their wares for a larger price than they are really worth. And yet to all of this the criminal code has no word to say. The man who can buy the space of a great paper to tell the wondrous qualities of the wares he has to sell is not the sort of man to come within the meshes of the penal code.

Remove dire poverty, as could easily be done with a tithe of what is now spent on force: let organised society meet the individual, not with force, but with helpfulness and love, and the inducement to commit crime could not exist. Let society be the friend not the tyrant, the brother not the jailor, and the feeling will be repaid a thousandfold.

CLARENCE S. DARROW, in "Resist not Evil."

Readers in West London who wish to have THE SOCIALIST STANDARD delivered at their addresses can do so by dropping a post card to H. Hutchins, 4, South Wharf Road, Paddington, W.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

To facilitate the transaction of the business of the Editorial and Management Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to conduct its official Organ, members of the Party and other readers are particularly requested to address all literary communications to the *Editorial Committee, 5, Arvon Road, Highbury, N.*, and all business correspondence, including Subscriptions and Advertisements, to *A. Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.*

(Signed) C. LEHANE, Secretary,
Editorial and Management Committee.

Terms of Subscriptions.

	£	s.	d.
Twelve Months	...	0	1 6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0	2 0
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5 6
Half Column do.	...	0	10 0
One Column do.	...	1	0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.

SATURDAY, APRIL 1, 1905.

THE CRY OF THE WORKLESS.

In the November issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD we showed that the unemployed problem could be solved only by the getting rid of the capitalist system of society, and that any attempt to solve this problem within the limits of the prevailing system of industrialism was so much wasted labour.

We offer no apology for again reverting to this question. The whole course of events since our article was written has more than borne out the strength of our contentions, and we are more than ever convinced of the uselessness of trying to combat the economic forces which make for an increase in the number of the unemployed by seeking the assistance of a capitalist government.

Unfortunately for the development of our views on this matter there exists a large number of men who, while admitting the cause of unemployment which we have adduced, viz., the development of machinery and the consequent concentration of capital in fewer hands, yet think that they can secure some amelioration of the life-condition of the workless working-men by trusting to the Government of the time.

With us they are aware that the introduction of more highly specialised machinery is permitting within the factory the liberation of many men formerly employed, and the substitution of women's labour for men's labour. Such a result is viewed as highly desirable by the capitalist who constantly scrutinises his wage-bill with the idea of reducing it, but for the worker the result is less desirable. For the latter it means a curtailment of his supply of food, and of the other necessities of life of himself and his family. His wages being, on the average, limited by the cost of maintaining himself and his family, any stoppage of his wages means a stoppage in his maintenance.

The extent to which the machine has ousted the worker may be ascertained by a glance at the census returns. Comparing the figures of 1891 with those for 1901 we find that there has been a great reduction of those employed in the textile industries at the same time that there has been a great increase in output. In the cotton trade there has been a great reduction both of men and women; so also in woollen and worsted, linen, silk; while in the lace industry an increase in the number of women has been nearly compensated by a reduction in the number of men employed. Again we must

remember that, in the various trades, not only has the number of those employed diminished, but the work of those employed has become more intermittent; out-of-work and short-time workers being on the increase.

These results arise naturally from the conditions of employment to-day. The owners of property are ever on the look-out for means of augmenting their possessions. They employ their capital in industrial operations simply for the purpose of deriving from its use profit or interest. So long as they get their profits increased they care little for the conditions under which the work in their factory, in their mine, or on their railway is carried on. They never seek to know whether those working for them are living happy and contented lives. For them the worker is an abstraction—the materialisation of some portion of their capital in exactly the same way as another portion of their capital shows itself as raw material, as auxiliary material, as factory building, or as finished product. He sees the worker figuring on his periodical balance-sheet as "Wages," and cares nothing that "Wages" means so many sentient human beings capable of thinking, loving, functioning even as he does.

Why then should he hesitate, when the markets are glutted, when his "wages" have been transformed into more goods than the market can consume, when goods cannot be sold because hungry men and women have not the wherewithal to buy food, when ill-clad children cannot have clothing provided for them because there is too much in the shops, to turn adrift those he no longer wishes to employ because they are no longer profitable?

And the result is invariably that, during periods when the markets are teeming with food and clothing, the workers are sent adrift and cannot purchase the things of which they are so sorely in need.

The only solution to this state of affairs is to abolish Capitalism. The whole trend of events is in the direction of Collectivist production and the inquirer into things political and economic can see that the capitalist, having ceased to be useful, is using the whole governmental machinery to safeguard the interests of his class.

The worker must learn that he has to look to himself and his fellows to work out the emancipation of the working-class. Only by combining to capture the political machinery and to use the power thus acquired for the overthrow of Capitalism can he hope to obtain, once and for all, a full and complete solution to the unemployed problem.

What then are we to think of those who admit these facts and yet inveigh against the Government for not dealing with the unemployed? The fact that the Government, and the class represented by the Government, have everything to gain from the existence of the unemployed ought to have prevented those people from begging for an autumn session to deal with the unemployed. By such an action they lead people to think that the unemployed problem may find its solution by trusting to parliaments composed of members of the middle-class.

This is the charge we make against those who, while pretending to lead, to organise, to direct the unemployed, believe that no solution of the problem is possible within capitalist society. They lead the workers to think that a solution is to be found without the change from Capitalism to Socialism which we have shown to be necessary. They lead them to think that Government, by holding autumn sessions to discuss the question, can take steps towards its solution. They beg for the class-issue in which

they pretend to believe. Mr. Keir Hardie refuses to raise the issue in the House of Commons because the Government have decided to shelve the matter by including a pious phrase in the King's Speech.

We can only believe that those who are engaged in this so-called organisation of the unemployed are doing so in order to make political capital out of it. They have no hope or belief that the unemployed workers themselves will prove valuable recruits to their movement but they think that there are others among the employed who will mistake their efforts for the genuine zeal of those who are in earnest, and who will join their party in consequence.

We have no faith in those beliefs. We do not think the efforts for the unemployed are sincere, and we believe the efforts now made will prove as futile to-day as they have always hitherto done. The unemployed will not be converted by them. The employed will not be befooled by them. They will not gain their political capital.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain stands out as the only party which has not tried to make the unemployed believe that they must trust to parties outside themselves. The unemployed—and every worker is every day more likely to fall within that category—must look to themselves and to their fellow-workers for the redress of their ills.

The poverty of their lives, the misery in which they dwell, can only be removed by a steady effort in the direction of proving to them that the unemployed question is but a phase of the social problem, and that the social problem is to be solved by removing the cause of the poverty and the misery, and the degradation of the working-class—the class-ownership of the means of producing and distributing wealth.

Workers, employed and unemployed! Rally round The Socialist Party of Great Britain and make it your party through which the change is to be brought about which shall secure to you and yours the guarantee of health and comfort and plenty.

RURAL POVERTY.

The recently published transactions of the Sociological Society in a volume of "Sociological Papers" (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.) contain an interesting addition to the investigations of Booth and Rowntree which should prove useful to the Socialist propagandist. An investigation into the conditions of "Life in an English Agricultural Village," by Mr. Harold H. Mann, discloses a condition of life among the rural proletariat that is sufficient of itself to condemn the proposals of certain superficial reformers to solve the unemployed problem by sending the unemployed "back to the land." The 30.1 per cent. of the population of London on or below the "poverty line"; the 29.8 per cent. of the population of York at or below the standard of "physical efficiency"; and the 34.3 per cent. of the population of this typical English agricultural village of Ridgmount in Bedford in a state of "primary poverty," present a problem that surely merits the attention of everybody, and particularly requires the consideration of the working-class who have to do all the suffering as well as all the work.

The village is a purely agricultural one, and is chosen as being most typical of the surrounding country, and almost all the population are engaged in agricultural pursuits. The Duke of Bedford is the greatest landowner, house-owner, and employer in the district. Mr. Mann finds, after a careful consideration of the prices of commodities in the village, that the minimum required to maintain an average family of husband, wife and three children, is 18s. 4d. per week. "Primary Poverty" is here taken to be that poverty caused by an insufficiency of earnings, even when most economically applied, to

provide for physical efficiency. "Secondary Poverty" is here taken to be that due to an uneconomical application of earnings." Having found the minimum necessary and investigated the actual income of each family in the population, the author submits in a table the results he is driven to, as follows:—

Total population	...	467
Total Working-Class Population	...	390
Total Families	...	127
Total Working-Class families	...	104
	pr. ct. of total	pr. ct. of w'g.-class.
Families in Primary Poverty	40	31.5
Popul'n in "	160	34.3

"The conclusion to which we come from a consideration of the figures, after every allowance has been made for subsidiary sources of income, is that no less than 34.3 per cent. of the population of a typical agricultural village in Bedfordshire do not obtain the necessary amount of money to enable them to remain in physical health. This percentage rises to 41.0 when the working-class alone is considered."

Following this comes another table showing the proportion living within 2s. and 6s. of the minimum, which I will repeat, as follows:—

	Pr. ct. of Wage Earners.	Pr. ct. of Total Popul'n.
Persons below Primary Poverty line
Less than 2s. per wk. above line	213	54.6
Less than 6s. per wk. above line	284	72.8

When this 6s. is added to the minimum it is only 24s. 4d. per week for a man, his wife, and three children, and 72.8 per cent. of the workers are below that standard of living.

Following that statement comes an investigation into the causes of Primary poverty under six different heads, and the results are submitted in a comprehensive table, as follows:—

Section	No. of Families	Immediate Cause of Poverty.	No. affected	Per cent. of Popul'n in Primary Poverty
1	5	Death or desertion of wage-earner	11	8 19
2	14	Illness or old age of wage-earner	3	23 26
3	—	Unemployment of wage-earner	—	—
4	6	Irregular employment of wage-earner	13	14 27
5	4	Largeness of family	25	8 33
6	11	Lowness of wages	31	24 55
40	Total		83	77 160

A detailed consideration is then given of specimen cases under each of the above heads, and if a bald statement of the normal condition is not sufficient, I will quote a few detail cases. Under head No. 2 is a case of "an old couple, the man deaf and quite incapable. The woman works at lace-making and cannot earn much more than about 2d. per day." The rest of the small income is due to parish relief.

The author explains the absence of unemployment at that period of the year at which the investigation took place: "If these figures had been obtained a month or two earlier (than October, 1903) they would probably have shown a considerable number out of work."

Another case merits particular notice. "A spinster makes her living entirely by lace-making, and works 10 or 12 hours per day for an income of about 3s. 6d. per week. The guardians refuse poor relief as she is a middle-aged woman; but heavy work is impossible to her and as her sight is failing it is not likely she will be able to keep up the present close work long."

The total deficiency works out as follows:—

	Secs. 1-2	Sec. 4	Secs. 5-6	Total
Under 16	...	14	13	56
16-25	...	1	4	7
25-55	...	7	6	23
Over 55	...	23	4	2

Secondary Poverty is necessarily more limited here than in the towns, and the following are the statistics:—

Persons in Secondary Poverty	...	33
Families	...	10
Percentage of Working-Class Population	...	9.0
" " Total Population	...	7.1
No. of Individuals per Family	...	3.3

Of the ten families in Secondary poverty, five are given as due to "the drink habit and its associated vices"; three to bad management at home, which bad management is given as

"sometimes through the overwork of the head of the household in getting a living"; in one case to uncertainty of work; and the remaining one to the wage-earner not working regularly. The total poverty, both Primary and Secondary, is summed up as follows:—

Families in Poverty	...	40	10	50
Population	...	160	33	193
Per cent. of Working-Class	...	41.0	9.0	50.0
Population	...	34.3	7.1	41.4
Per cent. of Total Popul'n	...	77	274	

The wage earners not in poverty are classified as follows:—

Total number of persons	...	197
" " families	...	54
Average size of	...	3.71
" family earnings	...	23s. 7d.
" rent	...	1s. 6d.
Per cent. of population	...	42.1

The author warns you not to forget that every penny earned by every member of the household is here counted, and cases of adult sons earning full money and living at home help to bring the average up. The next table shows that the number of young wage earners living with their parents and helping to swell the family income is an important factor, and their influence in keeping the family above the poverty line can be seen as follows:—

	Primary Poverty	Secondary Poverty	Not in Poverty
	pr. ct.	pr. ct.	pr. ct.
Under 16	...	51.9	30.3
16-25	...	7.5	15.2
25-55	...	22.5	39.4
Over 55	...	18.1	15.2

showing that the relative position of the family with regard to the poverty line is largely influenced by the age of the children. So powerful, indeed is this factor of the help supplied by children's wages, that without it "a vast proportion" of those at present over the line would be below it. Out of the 54 families of the workers over the poverty line only 40 would be above it if only the head of the family were earning wages, i.e., 25.9 per cent. of this group are dependent on the supplementary wage earners.

The trading and upper classes, we are told, are well over the poverty stage. Certainly we must expect that under Capitalism, the non-producers should be rich, and that the wealth-producer, the worker, should be poor!

The average weekly wage for the labourer, according to Mr. Mann's investigations, is 13s. 7d., and including extras from allotments, &c., is 14s. 4d.; while for foremen and others are included who earn considerably more than the labourers, the average only rises, including extras, to 14s. 11d., a sum considerably lower than that obtained by Mr. Wilson Fox for the Agricultural Commission.

He concludes with two caustic paragraphs, which I will quote in full:—

"Taking the actual figures obtained, it appears clear that a man earning the average rate of wages and the head of a household, must descend below the Primary poverty line so soon as he has two children, unless he is able to supplement his income by an allotment, by fattening and breeding pigs, or by other means. It is also clear that he will remain below the poverty line until the eldest child leaves school and begins to earn money, and that, even if he has no more than two children, his only chance to save will be in his later life when his children are grown up and are earning money, or have left home. This is the most favourable case: if there are more children the period of poverty is longer, and the chance of saving less. In any case, during life it is a continual round of poverty. During childhood, poverty conditions are almost inevitable. As a boy grows up there are a few years intermission till, as a young man, he has two children; then poverty again till these children grow up; and finally, at best, a penurious old age, barely lifted above the poverty line."

"I do not wish to draw conclusions in the present paper, but one thing I must say. The cry of 'back to the land' has a curious commentary in the results I have obtained. As at present existing, the standard of life on the land is lower than in the cities, the chances of success are less and of poverty are greater, life is less interesting, and the likelihood of the workhouse as the place of residence in old age the

greater. It is evident that the cry against the depopulation of the country and the concentration of population in the towns must remain little more than a parrot cry until something is done to raise the standard of life and hence the standard of wages in our purely agricultural districts—to increase the chances of success in life, to make life more interesting, and to bring about a more attractive old age than at present, when, under existing conditions, the workhouse is apt to loom too large on the horizon of the agricultural labourer."

I must remind the reader that this condition obtains now, when the power of wealth-production is greater than ever before, and that the conditions depicted affect that class that alone produces the wealth and makes the land fruitful. So long as the land and capital remain in the hands of a separate class, whose interests are thereby antagonised to the interests of the wage-worker; so long as the workers are forced to compete for a wage, the tendency will naturally be for that wage to fall to the lowest subsistence level. Wages, as wages, cannot be raised by any artificial means as the author appears to suggest, and the only remedy for the poverty problem in the country, as in the town, is the restoration of the worker to the land and to the tools necessary to wealth-production, and this will necessitate the abolition of the class-ownership of the means of living and the opening up of a new era for humanity by the establishment of the Socialist Republic.

DICK KENT.

TO YOUNG SPEAKERS.

MANY of our young speakers do their best, and are still disappointed. We can give them one or two tips which, if followed, will assist them. The very first essential to making a good speech on any question is to have an implicit belief that the side you are talking on is right. That essential is already possessed by all our speakers.

The next greatest essential is to know everything of your subject. If you can't know everything, know all that you can. Study Socialism, read Socialism, and in order to understand Socialism study capitalism, if you want to make a good speech about Socialism. You can't know too much about the subject; you can't possibly know enough. Know all that you can freeze on to.

An old friend of the writer, probably the greatest Socialist speaker in America to-day, once said to him: "My boy, the Worker gets here Friday. On Friday evening when I get home from work I sit me down and read the Worker—every word in it; not the headlines only, not the articles only of news, but every line—and then I know what is doing in Socialism, and I know what to say and how to say it."

Young speakers particularly should do this. But they should not stop there. Read a book now and then. Read a book worth the reading, and read it carefully. When you have read a chapter, stop and recall all the meat of it that you can. If there is some important part of it that you do not understand, or cannot recall clearly, go back and look it up. Learn to remember things that are worth remembering.

Not only read good books, but if you are a young speaker, read them aloud. Watch yourself. You will be surprised how many words you fail to pronounce distinctly, clearly. When you do that go back and read the sentence over again and again, as many times as may be necessary to enable you to acquire a habit of speaking in a clear tone and sounding every syllable of a word—no slurring.

If you will do these things—inform yourself on the subject, saturate yourself with it; read aloud, clearly, distinctly; read good, well-written books, so as to get the habit of speaking correctly, strongly, elegantly—do these things, and there is no reason why any young man of strength and good lungs and voice should not become not only a speaker, but an orator.—The Worker.

We regret that limitation of space has compelled us to hold over several interesting criticisms of the contribution by Mr. Philpott Wright which appeared in our last issue.

THE COMMUNE IN PARIS. MEETING IN LONDON.

[Specially reported for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.]

The thirty-fourth anniversary of the establishment of the Paris Commune was celebrated by a well attended meeting at Sydney Hall on Sunday, 19th March. The meeting was organised by the Battersea Branch of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and was creditable alike to the occasion which it commemorated and to the members of the Branch responsible for its organisation.

Comrade Crump presided, and after a short opening address called upon H. Neumann to deliver the first speech.

Neumann said that in honouring the memory of the men and women who participated in the struggle in '71, they were honouring some of the bravest pioneers of the movement of the working-class. The event known to history as the Commune of Paris was one of the most glorious, if saddest, in the annals of the proletariat. It showed the heroism of which the working-class was capable, while at the same time it demonstrated the fiendish brutality, the incredible cowardice and the all pervading treachery of the dominant class. Thirty or forty years ago, of course, the workers of France were in a different position to that which obtains to-day. Then Socialism was understood but by a few, but dim as was their perception of the nature of the class-struggle, confused as were their notions as to the economic reconstruction of society, the workers who in Paris in '71 raised the red flag over the Hotel de Ville and proclaimed the rights of labour, gave unmistakable evidence of the powers that were latent in the proletariat. When, through the incompetence and treachery of the French bourgeoisie, Paris had been occupied by the Prussians, the discontent of the metropolitan populace was great, but that discontent, though great, was ill-defined. Nobody, or at any rate no considerable section of the people, knew precisely what ought to be done, but when the corrupt Thiers government sought treacherously to disarm the National Guard, that is to say the working-class of Paris, some of the doubts were solved, and the workers, in successfully baffling the attempt to steal their cannon, were first thrown on the defensive and afterwards brought to a position when they had no alternative but, on the flight of the cowardly Thiers and his minions to Versailles, to set up the Commune and assert their rights such as they understood them to be. The working-class government of Paris under the Commune lasted only a few months. It was easy enough to see now that the Commune was doomed from the outset; but though the Commune failed and was deluged in a sea of blood, the lessons to be derived from the struggle were of first importance. They had heard a lot of talk nowadays, even from some professed Socialists, about the necessity of proceeding to revolution via reform, but let them learn a lesson from the Commune. How often had the Commune sent representatives to the capitalist government at Versailles for the purpose of establishing truces or entering into negotiations for the adjustment of their differences? Did not the working-class of Paris ask brother Capital at Versailles to arbitrate? And what was brother Capital's reply? Thiers said there was to be no negotiation: he wanted the unconditional surrender of Paris. Surely if there was any truth in the contention that reforms were to be got from the capitalist class, here was an occasion on which a great opportunity was afforded to that class of granting "palliative" measures, and avoiding bloodshed; but what occurred? The material interests of the masters were threatened by an armed section of the working-class, the class-feeling and class-hatred of the bourgeois for the proletariat were aroused, and instead of granting reforms the capitalists waded ankle deep in the blood of the Parisian workers. Let the workers prepare themselves in the school of revolution to deal with the impending collapse of capitalist society.

F. C. Watts spoke next. It was a good thing to hold these Commune meetings. To many, even yet, the word "Commune," meant upheaval, anarchy and bloodshed; but to Socialists the Commune signified the fight between the working-class and the capitalist-class. The

acted wisely and well. Schemes were set afoot for opening the disused factories, by handing them over to be worked co-operatively by the workers, and schemes for forming communes in other parts of France were promoted, but owing to the superior force of circumstances these and other proposals did not fructify. The Commune, however, was a great example of the international solidarity of the working-class. One of the soldiers of the Commune, while at his post on a barricade, was asked what he was dying for. "Human solidarity" was the answer. That brave worker, dying for the brotherhood of man, was an example of what the Commune stood for. The Commune showed more clearly than any other movement that when the working-class really stand for their own, when they Commune, far from implying crime, denoted the absence of crime, for while the Commune held sway, a man or woman was safer in Paris with the Communards than in Versailles with the French Government, with its forgers, swindlers, and nondescript hangers on. Crime there was, but not on the part of the workers. The charge of incendiarianism had been made, but when the working-class, driven to desperation, burned the public buildings, they did so because the Versailles Government cared more for the public buildings than for the lives of the people. The difficulties the Commune had to face were hardly appreciated. They were fighting their own countrymen outside the walls, with spies and traitors within, but notwithstanding these difficulties the Paris Commune, in many respects, really menace the interests of the capitalist-class, that class will use every means to crush the working-class movement. The capitalists resolved that they would crush the *canaille* and wipe out the whole breed. But though they succeeded in crushing the Commune, they failed in wiping out the working-class movement, which was immeasurably stronger to-day than it was then. The working-class movement, though it vigorously asserted itself in '71, did not, of course, begin at that time, for in '48, while not near so ripe as that movement was in '71, they became troublesome to their masters, and instituted the Social Republic. A quarter of a century produced changes, for in '71 the working-class to a certain extent realised that not alone must the political machinery be controlled but that industry likewise must be controlled. They realised, moreover, not fully perhaps, but anyhow more fully than before, that the master-class and not the foreigner was the enemy. As Karl Marx had said, there must be no truce between the working-class and the master-class of France and of every country, and as heralding that great coming struggle of classes the memory of the Commune would always be cherished by the working-class.

A. Anderson, who followed, said that viewed from the standpoint of the working-class there was no revolution in '48, nor could it be said that there was a revolution in '71. The upheavals of these periods were certainly not working-class revolutions, for despite the fact that the workers took part in these movements, their objective was not the advancement of the material interest of the working-class, and the Social Revolution would be a failure unless the Socialists saw to it that they had behind them the well organised support of the working-class. To get an example of what a revolution really meant that movement which culminated in France in 1789 would have to be studied. Then the whole of society was stirred to its roots by social development acted upon by the litterateurs and champions of the rising middle-class. Prior to '89 the bourgeoisie had diffused that knowledge which was necessary to dispel the old ideas of property, and by an educational propaganda the peasants through their material interests were enlisted on the side of the new order. The peasants burned the castles and the leases of the feudal aristocracy, whose reign was speedily brought to an end. The Voltaires and the Rousseaus of the middle-class had well prepared the ground and the bourgeois revolution triumphed. With regard to the working-class, they were not a political force at all before '71, and the Commune marked the baptism of fire of the working-class in the political field. The events associated with the Commune showed clearly that the capitalist-class is the most cowardly class that ever figured in the world's history. They fled from

Paris to save their skins, while the working-class were compelled to rise and take hold of the reins of government. A great deal had been said about the shooting of hostages—it had been said there was a bloody week, a bloody month. But it took longer than a week or a month to satisfy the ferocity of the capitalist-class, for between January '71 and January '72 the number of insurgents arrested by the Thiers government was 38,578: of these 10,131 were sentenced to imprisonment, and 23,121 were shot. Let the revolutionists of to-day teach the workers that while for their own ends the Liberal and Tory sections of the capitalist-class were playing with them, to deceive and decoy them into supporting capitalism by promises of reform here and promises of reform there, when the workers determined to fight for their own cause they would be shot down just as mercilessly as were the men and women of the Paris Commune. The Commune failed because the moment had not struck for the Social Revolution, and before that could be brought about a large amount of educational work must be done. The working-class must realise that it is not by putting men into power over their heads and imagining that in that way a revolution would be brought about from the top, that their emancipation would be accomplished. The working-class revolution must commence with the working-class itself, intelligently organised and well-disciplined. Then and now the heart of the people was sound, but revolutions were not questions of the heart, a revolution was a question of the brain. The duty of the hour was to educate the working-class into a knowledge of its power and mission, to clear away the confusions created by Liberalism and Toryism and thoroughly discredit the pretensions of spurious Labourism and alleged Socialism. The flag of the Commune was the heirloom of the working-class, and if the banner of Socialism was let fall by one organisation, another party must spring into existence to rear it aloft. The Socialist Party of Great Britain guarded the flag in this country, and had never compromised. Let its members go forward with good cheer and carry the ensign of freedom into every town and hamlet in the land.

J. Fitzgerald then mounted the platform, and referring to the statement frequently made by capitalist writers, to wit that in establishing the Commune the workers had chosen the wrong time, said that this was a favourite argument of the upholders of capitalism. When the workers tried to better themselves, they were always told it was the wrong time. In fact never had the workers done anything that was not done at the wrong time. In 1830 the capitalists were compelled to give the workers some political power, and in 1848 the workers had political power, and weapons to defend it. The men of property never relished the idea of seeing arms in the possession of the men of no property, and the reason was obvious. Thiers saw that if the capitalists of France were to continue as the dominant class, the working-class must no longer have arms, and it was decided that the National Guard must be disarmed. These arms were not the property of the government, as they were paid for by public subscription: and moreover at the surrender of Paris to the Prussians it was clearly stipulated that they were not to be given up. But Thiers ordered them to be seized, and in the night a detachment of the military marched on Montmartre to steal the cannon of the National Guard. The attempted governmental theft was discovered just in time, and the Parisian working-class refused to be disarmed. That was the beginning of the revolt. The working-class, however, had not then realised that the only people the working-class could rely upon were the working-class themselves, and so they were looking for help and counsel from some middle-class men who only succeeded in muddling matters. The establishment of the Commune came as a surprise to the rest of France, for when the Commune issued a manifesto to the other towns, the people in the provinces said they did not know the men who signed the manifesto. This in itself was sufficient evidence that the ground had not been prepared, and even in quarters where perhaps assistance might have been expected the Paris workers were sadly disappointed. The radical left, the men who were "coming our way," were determined

not to help the working-class, and to-day should a crisis involving similar grave issues be precipitated, history would repeat itself, and the men who are "coming our way" would be found wanting. Let the Socialist working-class beware of these men. From the Commune many important lessons were to be derived, the first being the unreliability of any section of the capitalist-class. Secondly it showed clearly that the working-class ought to look askance at the students, the class that provided the material for future "intellectuals," for during the struggle in '71 the Latin quarter, the students' quarter, went over to Versailles, whence they heaped opprobrium on the working-class. We were told by "Social-Democratic" papers to-day that the students in Russia were aiding the working-class, but the converse would be nearer the truth. The Russian revolution now in progress was a middle-class revolution, and it was misleading to say that it was a working-class revolution. He (the speaker) found all doubts on the subject vanish when he heard that the students in Russia were in the movement. Another point to be noted in connection with the Commune was the fact that the working-class had not half enough hatred nor half enough organisation. The working-class will learn yet that the class struggle is war to the knife against capitalism, a war which allows of no parleying with the enemy. Thiers demanded the unconditional surrender of Paris, and to-day in like language, The Socialist Party of Great Britain demanded the unconditional surrender of the capitalist-class. Organisation was of prime importance, for without a sound organisation of the working-class there would be another Commune—another wholesale slaughter of the workers. He had heard someone once say that what they ought to do is to wait for a while and then "make a rush for it." Make a rush with what? Without organisation nothing could be done. Again, they had been told by some worthy people, even by a man of the stamp of Morris, that the soldiers would fraternise with the people. Did the soldiers fraternise in '71? No, they did not do so, nor would they do it to-day, for the soldiers of capitalism are kept apart from the people, and do not sympathise with the people. The soldier as a rule only learnt to obey orders and would shoot when told. The Commune also showed the nature of the "religion" of the disciples of Christ, as the treatment of the wounded by the Sisters of "Mercy" testified. Finally, the utter uselessness of "humanity" in dealing with the foes of the working-class was shown during the Paris struggle. Let them realise that there would be no successful revolution of the working-class until that class had studied well the economic and political history of the workers: until the memory of the working-class is well stored with a knowledge of what has been done to them by the ruling-class. Cluseret, who in a manifesto told the Paris workers that without military organisation the workers could be relied upon to defeat the best strategist, was a dangerous fool. Let them beware of the Cluserets of to-day, and learn above all that there was no hope from "Labourism," "bogus Socialism," or any other manifestation of capitalist politics.

E. J. B. Allen, who spoke next, wished to draw the attention of the workers to the fact that when the Commune rose, the capitalist-class who were previously divided, united against the working-class. The French capitalist government did not kill all the working-class because then the capitalists would have to do their own work. In addition to the lack of organisation shown during the Commune, there was also the fact that the working-class did not understand its mission, but if the Commune was a failure it still stood as a beacon light for the workers of to-day. Let the watchword be "No compromise," for any movement that compromised was doomed to failure.

C. Lehane said that it was indeed fitting that that meeting held to honour the men and women of '71 should be called together in Sydney Hall, the premises of the Battersea Branch of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. Battersea would go down in the annals of the Party as the Montmartre of the Socialist movement in Great Britain. As in '71 with the attempted seizure of the guns at Montmartre the Parisian working-class had the first brush with the

enemy, so in 1904, with the passage of what was known as the "Battersea resolution," at Battersea, the working-class of London exchanged the first shot with capitalism and all the forces of reaction. Well he remembered that engagement, for he was present when Ernest Allen, the previous speaker, who commanded the Battersea Battery on the 15th of May last, fired that well directed and penetrating shell which spread such confusion among the ranks of the enemy. As a result of that shot, The Socialist Party of Great Britain sprang into existence to fight and win the battle of the working-class. It had been pointed out that when the Commune issued a manifesto to the provinces calling upon them to act, the answer came that the manifesto was signed by unknown men. The manifesto issued on behalf of the "Battersea Meeting" calling for the formation of The Socialist Party of Great Britain was also signed by "unknown men," but he, the speaker, trusted that the response to that manifesto from provincial Britain would be more cheering and more decisive than that which came to the Paris manifesto in '71. Let the Socialists in the provinces rally to the support of those who in the metropolis were doing battle on behalf of the working-class of Great Britain and of the world. At the present time they should not calculate on any chance luck or happy accident, but they should go forward steadily with the work of organisation. Depending on the soldiers to fraternise with the people in the hour of need was trusting to chance, for it was only a chance. Let them remember the "fraternising" that took place at Mitchelstown and at Featherstone. In Ireland the military police sent their *billets-doux* in the shape of bullets and in England the soldiers sent their love-messages at long range. The butchers of Featherstone served the soldiers with bullets capable of cutting through 35 inches of solid elm, and the capitalists would yet have reason to believe the workers were wooden-headed if they did not recognise that in the last resort they had nothing to rely on but their own well-disciplined strength. Let them learn from the coalescence of the French and German capitalist governments against the working-class of Paris in '71, that the "patriotism" by which reactionaries tried to keep asunder the workers of all countries, was only a snare, and let them realise that the development of the economic forces demanded international action on the part of the working-class. International solidarity to-day transcended geographical boundaries, for rivers were bridged and mountains scaled by mankind in its onward march.

The meeting, having given hearty cheers for the Commune of '71, the Social Revolution to come, and The Socialist Party of Great Britain, was brought to a conclusion by the singing of "the International."

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

G. S. (Paddington).—It is apparent that your acquaintance with the *Clarion* has improved neither your Socialism nor your manners. By the regular reading of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD the former may in time develop; but for the latter there is no medicine in the pharmacopoeia of political economy.

Dr. E. (Vienna).—Your communication is having attention.

B.S.I. (Brussels).—Manifesto of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation received.

A. H. (Walthamstow).—Many thanks for extracts and election address. After all, Bailey, in running as a Labour candidate is only doing that which very many members of the S.D.F. do although their votes are claimed in *Justice* as S.D.F. votes. Recent elections in Hammersmith, Fulham, &c., are instances.

J. C. R. (Soham).—We are always pleased to receive intelligent comment as to our proceedings. Extract is being used, with thanks. With regard to Alderman Phillips' letter it seems to us that a good churchman, of whatever denomination, must place his church first, and we are as much opposed to the Labour movement being captured for the greater glory of the church as to the decoy-duck business of the labour "leader." Religious organisations are inherently pro-capitalist, and are therefore opposed to what we consider to be the interests of the working-class. We claim that Socialism without adjectives is sufficient, and only when the Socialist Republic is established will a good life be possible. Conduct is determined by economic conditions, not by theological beliefs.

WATFORD BRANCH REPORT.

LABOUR MISLEADERS AND THE LOCAL ELECTIONS. SINCE our last report two or three more "labour" organisations have been born, while some of the old ones have died or lapsed into moribundity. At any rate we never hear of them. Altogether we have now not more than a dozen bodies (mainly composed of very much the same people) all convinced that something really ought to be done for the working man but none very clear as to what should be done. Thus we had the organ of one body crying out upon the local Council that could not find anything better than a few hours in the gravel pits for the unemployed, and gravely suggesting that the Council ought to set them to work putting sand on frosty roads! (It is only fair to add that we have had at least 3 days upon which the roads were in a bad condition through frost).

Thus again the I.L.P. after threatening public meetings which are never held takes its courage in both hands and suddenly rushes into public life with a revolutionary proposal to obliterate the betting news in the public reading room. After which, flushed with the success of their maiden effort, they hold a public meeting upon the unemployed problem—this being "the thing" at the moment—and secure the services of an estimable and reverend lecturer, who admitted that he did not know much about the unemployed, or that he was expected to speak upon the unemployed, and who confined himself to relating his experiences among the "poor dear fellows" in the Belgium Labour Colonies or Penitentiaries—who have such a splendid time of it (according to the reverend gentleman) with their reading-rooms, smoking rooms, and other luxurious conveniences that the authorities have to dig a deep and wide trench all round the colony to prevent them running away!

And now the Trades Council are contesting the Urban Council elections and working-class support is asked for because the other candidates have no programmes worth talking about. A few short months since the Trades Council were running their candidates with no programme at all, and only adopted the present attenuated apology for a programme because their hands were forced by those who now form the Watford Branch of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. And these are the good and earnest but illinformed and misguided folk who believe that they are remedying the evils under which the workers suffer! And they seem to think that in a multiplication of societies is much wisdom. Instead of which of course it is a potent cause of working-class confusion.

How can the workers understand unless the issues are kept clear? And how can the issues be kept clear when half a score of organisations persist in poking their petty programmes between the eyes of the workers and the real cause of the workers' condition. What the workers of this town want in common with the workers of every other town, is a plain statement of the position as it affects them and clear reasons why nothing but Socialism will suffice. And there is no organisation in this district other than the Watford Branch of The Socialist Party of Great Britain presenting this plain statement and these clear reasons. All the others are engaged in deluding the workers into the belief that something less than Socialism will avail.

And so we ask that those whom this paper reaches in Watford before the elections take place shall refuse support not only to the capitalist candidates of the Tradesmen's Association, but also to the "Labour" candidates of the Trades Council. The former cannot help the workers and don't propose to. The latter, with their programme (!), are equally impotent. There is nothing for the workers of Watford to do in this or any other election other than to organise their forces for the capture of the Urban Council and all other political machinery, not with the object of securing a few absolutely inadequate and entirely useless reforms, but with the object of using their power to the best advantage by concentrating directly upon the only change that will affect them, *viz.*, the transfer of the means of life from out the hands of those who at present control them (the capitalist class) into the hands and the control of the whole people. Join the Watford Branch!

THE FREEDOM OF SLAVERY.

The following is from the "Daily Mirror." It shows how even the capitalist Press will speak the truth sometimes:—

"Slaves cannot breathe in England; if their lungs Receive our air, that moment they are free."

"So wrote the poet Cowper, and his lines summed up the feeling which Englishmen had about slavery in the days when the agitation for its abolition was going on."

"Even now the very talk of slavery arouses indignation. Yet what humbug it is! How many of us have thought out for ourselves the question whether it would not be better for thousands of people in Britain to-day to be slaves rather than free men?"

"What is the 'freedom' of the man who depends upon his labour and cannot find employment? He is 'free' to tramp about all day looking for work; 'free' to see others warm and well-fed while he shivers and gnaws a crust; 'free' to grow weaker and weaker as cold and hunger tell upon his frame; 'free' to sink down beaten, 'free' to starve slowly, 'free' to die."

"Slaves, at any rate, are looked after; fed and clothed sufficiently; given a roof over their heads. In the old slavery days it was as rare to find a man who neglected or ill-treated his human possessions as it is nowadays to come across cruel or careless owners of horses and cattle."

"Brions regard slavery with horror, but at the same time many of them treat their free workpeople far worse than they would treat slaves. If a slave dies it is a loss to his owner. If a 'free' worker dies there are dozens of others eager for his job. His death makes no difference to an employer at all."

"A man in the depths of despair, starving, shoeless, shattered by the misery he had gone through, wrote to us for help. At the end of his letter was a sentence which arrested our attention. Even slavery, he said, would be infinitely preferable to such a life as his."

"We have bought this man in order to show to what depths it is possible to sink in this 'free' country of ours, where the name of slavery is abhorred, but where enormous numbers of 'free' men and women fall into a state compared to which slavery would be a pleasant and easy condition of life."

The man (whose name and address was published) was told by the "Daily Mirror" to show himself."

"A short man came, a man with a face that had once been full of intelligence and keenness, but which was now pulled out of its proper shape by misery. A man who walked with a heart-broken walk—with a walk that walks hopeless creatures to self-destruction. A hopeless man."

"I am the man who wants to be a slave," he said.

"The bitterness of his tone was that terrible bitterness that is an amalgam of despair and nonchalance."

"But are you worth buying? What is your price?" he was asked.

"His square chin thrust itself out and for a moment looked like the sturdy, independent chin nature had meant it to be."

"I will sell myself for £10," he said, "and victuals and shelter."

"But you are not worth £10; at least, why should you be worth £10? What can you do?"

"I don't know—anything," was the miserable answer.

"Will you sell yourself for £2?"

"Yes."

"That was how we got our slave."

"We had to buy him from sheer pity."

Two pounds! Less than the price of a horse. Less than the price of an ass. Is the Socialist so very wrong when he asserts that hundreds of thousands of the working-class of "free" England would be better off, materially, in a state of chattel slavery? Under such a condition they would at least have food and clothing and shelter, where to-day they have little of either, and can be bought as an act of charity for two pounds!

And yet the transaction of the "Daily Mirror" is not exceptional. Quite the contrary. Every member of the working-class sells himself or,

which is the same thing, his power to labour, every time he can find an employer to buy him. He sells himself, generally speaking, for just the amount that will keep him in working condition and enable him to reproduce his kind. He sells himself for his keep without even receiving, as in the case of the man purchased by the "Daily Mirror," a bonus of £2. Indeed, he can sometimes be found offering a bonus of £2 to anyone who will give him information that will enable him to sell himself!

That he receives wages wherewith to buy the things necessary to the maintenance of life does not alter the fact of the sale; does not alter the fact that he is the property, the slave, of the man who buys him.

And yet because, when he is fortunate enough to find a buyer for his labour power (himself), he receives a sum that enables him to buy what he likes within the limits of that sum, he thinks himself free—a delusion most sedulously fostered by the parsons and politicians and apologists for the present system.

He is free because he can choose how he shall spend his pitiable "earnings"—whether in scrag-of-mutton or corned beef! Free because he can leave one master when he likes, although to get another—for a master he must have under present conditions if he is to live—is a task he may find it no easy matter to compass as the "Daily Mirror" slave seems to have discovered to his sorrow. Freedom! Was ever such a travesty on words?

Little as it was expected the "Daily Mirror" has spoken sober truth as to the advantages of chattel slavery over present-day "freedom," for the worker's "freedom" has brought him nothing but a more precarious dependency. But when this Harmsworth journal says it has bought a man and implies thereby that such a transaction is unusual, it is simply blurring the indisputable fact that every worker sells himself; that every employer buys a slave.

When the working-class have accepted that truth, and have accepted the further truth which The Socialist Party of Great Britain exists to propagate, viz., that their condition with all its concomitant misery is directly due to the fact that the workers are separated from the means by which they live—have no control over the land and the machinery by which wealth is produced from the land and distributed, because these means are held and controlled by the employing or capitalist-class, they will be ready to appreciate the force of the contention of the Socialist Party that in the substitution of common ownership and control of the means of life for the present individual ownership, and in that alteration alone lies the remedy, a remedy that can be applied when the workers have appreciated, but not until then.—G.J.H.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain,
BATTERSEA BRANCH.

A Grand Bazaar

Will be held at

SYDNEY HALL,

York Road, Battersea.

On SATURDAY, APRIL 22nd,
MONDAY, 24th, and
TUESDAY 25th.

All able to assist in any way should communicate immediately with

A. JONES, 4, Matthew Street,
Latchmere Estate, Battersea.

Branch Secretaries and others
SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

Printed by Jacomb Bros., 2a, Wingfield Road, Stratford, E. for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published by C. Lehan, Gen. Secretary, 107, Charlotte St., W.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

CENTRAL OFFICE:

COMMUNIST CLUB,
107, CHARLOTTE ST., LONDON, W.
General Secretary C. LEHANE.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Business transacted every Saturday at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W. Membership in the Central Branch can be obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—Kate Hawkins, sec., 47, Wilton Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilton Square, W.C.

EAST LONDON (Central).—G. Fletcher, Sec., 305, Wilmott Street, Bethnal Green, E. Branch meets every Friday at the Secretary's address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 34, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 49, Mablethorpe Rd., Fulham Cross, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m.

ISLINGTON.—Padraig Ua Toibin, Secretary, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets every Tuesday at 8.30 p.m. at the Co-operative Stores, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—J. Kent, Secretary, 5, Rutland Road, Ilford. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Fridays in each month at 8.30 at secretary's address.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.

WATFORD.—G. T. King Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays in month, Economic Class 2nd and 4th Sunday, at 3 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. J. Hodson, Secretary, 'Kelmescott,' Sidney Road, Forest Gate, E. Branch meets every alternate Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at the address given.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

SYDNEY HALL

38, YORK ROAD,
BATTERSEA, S.W.

Sunday Night Lectures

The following Lectures will be delivered at the above hall during April:

April 2: H. NEUMAN.

Subject: LABOUR REPRESENTATION.

April 9: J. KENT.

Subject: WHERE TEETOTALLERS ARE WRONG.

April 16: T. A. JACKSON.

Subject: REVOLUTION.

April 23: R. KENNY.

Subject: SOCIALISM & TRADE UNIONISM.

TIME 7 p.m. ADMISSION FREE.
ALL WORKERS INVITED.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 9. Vol. I.]

LONDON, MAY, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

ENQUIRIES INVITED.

BRANCHES WANTED IN EVERY
TOWN IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Inventions: A Capitalist Monopoly.

RECENTLY in a London Police Court an Engineer was charged with stealing two sheets of drawing paper belonging to his employers. The employers, however, were not so much interested in obtaining the paper as the drawings it bore. Property in drawings on paper is not defined by law, but the right to such property has been frequently asserted by enforcing the right to the paper. In this case the defendant had been sent to inspect the exhibits at Olympia Motor Exhibition, and as the result of these visits "at his employers' directions and expense" he developed ideas for the invention of a new gear box, the rough sketch of which he outlined on paper, "doing his drawing work in his employers' time, at his employers' office, with his employers' materials." The magistrate notwithstanding discharged the defendant, it being in his judgment "impossible to say that any invention which might earn £1000 a year belonged to those who paid the inventor £3 a week."

Now this form of property comes under the classification of "Intellectual Property," and it will be observed that the right to such property is not legally defined, being, as the plaintiff's solicitor put it, "as in the dark ages." Neither did the magistrate give judgment in favour of the defendant as a matter of principle, but solely in consideration of the comparative insignificance of his salary.

Why is the right to intellectual property so ill-defined? Lafargue, in an admirable little pamphlet entitled "*Le Socialisme et Les Intellectuels*," touches upon this subject. He says: "Material property, whatever may be its origin, is declared eternal by capitalist law: it is assured for ever to its possessor, handed down from father to son until the end of time, no power, civil or political, being able to lay sacrilegious hands upon it."

"Capitalist law has none of these considerations for intellectual property. Literary and artistic property, the only forms which the law protects, have but a precarious duration, limited (in France) to the life time of the author, and to a certain period after his death; 50 years according to the latest legislation. This moment passed, the right succumbs and falls in the public way: so that from March of the present year (1900) publishers can enrich themselves by publishing the works of Balzac, the genius of romantic literature."

"Literary property, if of importance to publishers, in reality not a very numerous class, does not yield any profit to the capitalists as a whole; but it is not thus with the property in inventions, which is of supreme importance to the industrial and commercial capitalists together. Likewise the law extends no protection whatever to it. The inventor, if he desires to defend his intellectual property against the bourgeois plunderers, must begin by buying this right by taking out a patent, which must be renewed annually. One day behind time in paying the tax, his intellectual property becomes the legitimate prey of the capitalist robbers. Even while paying this sum regularly his right is limited to 14 years (in France). During this short number of years, generally insufficient to have his invention completely adopted in prac-

tical industry, it is he, the inventor, who at his own expense must put in movement the legal machinery against the bourgeois plunderers who would seize it.

"The 'trade mark,' which is a form of capitalist property, never having demanded any intellectual effort, is on the contrary indefinitely protected by law like material property."

"The capitalist has only grudgingly granted to the inventor the right to defend his intellectual property, because by his right of reigning class, he believes himself master of the fruits of intellectual labour as well as of manual labour, just as the feudal lord arrogated to himself the right of possession over the property of his serfs."

"The capitalist-class, the most revolutionary class that has ever oppressed human society, cannot increase its riches but by incessantly revolutionising the means of production by the never-ending introduction of new applications of the mechanical, physical, and chemical sciences to the industrial tool. Its thirst for inventions is so insatiable that it has created factories of inventions. Several American capitalists have associated in organising at Mungo Park, for Edison, the most marvellous laboratory in the world. Here they have placed at his disposition an army of scientists, the aristocrats of labour, and the material means necessary to make and continue making the inventions that the capitalists patent, exploit, or sell. Edison, who is himself one of the sharpest of business men, has, however, taken precautions in order to insure his participation in the profits which the inventions of Mungo Park will yield."

"But all inventors cannot, like Edison, impose their conditions on the capitalists who build factories of inventions to exploit them. The Thompson-Houston Company at Paris, Siemens in London and Berlin, have, side by side with their electrical machinery, workshops and laboratories where engineers are engaged in research work, seeking new applications of electricity. At Frankfurt in the factory of aniline colours, the largest in the world, and where the mineral antipyrine was discovered, there are more than one hundred chemists paid to discover new chemical products. Each discovery is immediately patented by the firm, which, by way of encouragement, gives some reward to the inventor."

"To a certain point we can consider all factories and workshops as laboratories of inventions, because a considerable number of improvements in machinery have been found out by the workmen in the course of work. As the inventor has not the necessary money to patent or apply his discovery, the employer takes out the patent in his own name, and thus, as bourgeois justice wishes it, it is he who gathers all the accruing profits therefrom. When the government thinks of rewarding talent it is the employer who is rewarded; the workman inventor, who is but an "intellectual," continues toiling on as before, and as in this capitalist world one must be contented with little, he consoles himself in his misery, saying that his invention brings profit and honour to his master."

"Will the intellectuals yet hear the voice of the Socialists calling them to the rescue to free Science and Art from the capitalist yoke, and liberate thought from the slavery of wagedom?"

P. J. TOBIN.

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

MARR'S THEORY OF SURPLUS-VALUE.

In a recent issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD it was suggested that readers having doubts and difficulties as to any phase of Socialism or of the Socialist movement should forward them to the Editorial Committee, and endeavours would be made to have these doubts and difficulties removed. This suggestion has been followed by a sufficient number of readers to justify the setting aside of a portion of the paper under the heading of "Doubts and Difficulties," and we hope that our readers will help us to make it of permanent interest and utility.

The Editorial Committee have asked me to undertake the conducting of this section of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, and I have consented, after some hesitation, to look after it for the present. I do not for a moment claim that I shall prove infallible in my solutions to the economic, historic, and other problems set me, but I do not think I shall ever be found wrong. In the event of the answer to any question proving somewhat hazy to any readers I feel confident that they will say so, and every criticism will be ever welcome.

My attention has been called by one of my correspondents to a letter which has appeared in the *Social Democratic Herald*, published by the Social Democratic Publishing Company, of Milwaukee, wherein a Mr. Henry B. Ashplant, of London, Ontario, takes it upon himself to criticize adversely the surplus-value theory of Marx. He takes and disputes Marx's illustration of the yarn manufacturer who invests his 27s. capital in the purchase of raw material, machinery, and labour-power. For raw material he gives 20s., while his machinery costs him 4s. and labour-power 3s. When the expenditure of the labour-power has, with the aid of the machinery, worked up the raw material into yarn, the finished product is sold for 30s.

The question which Mr. Ashplant desires to have elucidated is "Whence originates this 3s.?" Is it derived from the spinner, or from the machinery, or from the raw material, or from the capitalist, or from the buyer of the yarn?

To quote his own words: "Who paid the 3s. realised by the yarn manufacturer? If the 3s. is paid by the spinner then, I ask, where did the spinner get the extra 3s. from in view of the fact that he enters the market possessed of only his labour-power, which he sells to the capitalist for 3s. only. How then can it be shown that he pays to the capitalist this 3s., plus an additional 3s. which he never possessed as a spinner?"

Again he says: "The yarn is sold to a third party whom we may call No. 3. Now to which class does No. 3 belong? Does he belong to the capitalist-class? If so, then indeed the 3s. is not paid by No. 2 class, viz., the spinner. Does No. 3 belong to the working-class? If so, then I ask where does he who possesses nothing but his labour-power secure this 3s. which he pays to No. 1 in excess of what he receives from No. 1, the capitalist-class?"

"As I have before intimated," continues Mr. Ashplant, "I do not dispute the fact that social energy, including the labour of superintendence, produced the 20 lbs of yarn for which only 3s. was paid to labour, but I do dispute the soundness of the analysis in Marx's 'Capital,' as focussed in this yarn illustration."

Such then is the contention of the genial Ashplant, who does "not in any sense speak disrespectfully of the great work of this truly great master thinker," and does not "need 'Capital' or the surplus-value theory as marked out by Karl Marx in this yarn transaction, to explain the terrible phenomena in my industrial environment."

The amazing condescension in the letter even powers even my native modesty, so much so that I hesitate to assail "his argument with the sword of my logic with a view to letting out its vital principle."

What is the Marxian theory of surplus-value? In the first place the theory is essentially bound up with Marx's theory of value as being materialised labour-power. Value, according to Marx, is the embodiment of labour-power in material articles, and is measured by the average amount of labour-time socially necessary to produce them.

Since value is labour-power materialised in commodities, values can be created only by the expenditure of labour-power. That this is the only source of value must be ever borne in mind when considering the problem of surplus-value.

Marx contends that surplus-value is the value created by the worker in excess of his own necessary means of subsistence, and I, for one, cannot see how our industrial environment can be explained except in terms of such surplus-value.

The fallacies which Mr. Ashplant appears to make are the identification of labour-power with labour, and the assumption, implicitly made, that the sum of all the "uses in existence remains a constant quantity. Doubtless he would be the first to deny these two principles, but nevertheless they run throughout the whole of his criticism.

Labour and labour-power are two entirely distinct things, or at least, two distinct phases of the same thing. Labour-power is potential; labour is kinetic. Labour-power is the power of working; labour is that power in action. Labour is the expenditure of labour-power.

Value being the embodiment in commodities of expended labour-power, we must look to the expenditure of labour-power—the activity of man, physical, mental, and moral—for the source of all value, whether it be of the raw material, the machinery, or the consumable articles which go to the replacement of man's power of working.

In taking the division of the yarn manufacturer's capital into so much money for raw material, so much for machinery, and so much for labour-power, we must bear in mind that the facts underlying the whole question are relative to labour-power rather than to money.

As, however, we are dealing with it in terms of money, let us see whether there are any difficulties which vitiate the reasoning of Mr. Ashplant. The yarn capitalist starts with 27s., which he proceeds to lay out as indicated above, viz., 24s. for raw material and machinery, and 3s. for labour power. Three persons figure in the transaction: the yarn manufacturer originally possessing his 27s., the spinner with his labour-power valued at 3s., and the purchaser of the completed yarn with 30s. At the end of the transaction the first has 30s., the second 3s., and the third the finished product.

Now, the machinery and the raw material purchased by the capitalist possess a value which represents so much expended labour-power, and is measured by a money value of 24s. But machinery and raw materials can expend no labour-power and cannot, therefore, create any new value. In so far as they are socially necessary to the completion of the finished product, their values—the labour-power expended in their own production—are simply transferred to that product.

The purchaser of the finished product receives in exchange for his finished product a value of 30s. in commodities as represented by the yarn. Hence from him arises no surplus-value.

We have to look then to the second party in

the transaction, the spinner, to ascertain if he can throw any light upon the origination of our new surplus-value of 3s.

In the Ashplant theory the spinner, possessing only his labour-power worth 3s., can only transfer an equivalent value of 3s. to the finished commodity in the same way that the machinery and the raw material transfer their value. But is this so? The value of the labour-power of the worker is the value of his cost of subsistence whereas the value of his labour may be more or less than his cost of subsistence, according to the duration of the working-day. Under capitalism it is invariably more.

If Mr. Ashplant's view were correct it would matter little to the capitalist what number of hours constituted the working-day. The labour-power of the labourer was transferred to his product irrespective of the length or shortness of that day. But the capitalist thinks otherwise. The capitalist is aware that after the worker has been engaged in production for a certain number of hours he has created a value equal to the value of his own labour-power, and that any additional working on his part is towards the production of a value over and above what he possessed at the beginning of the working-day, and which he continues to possess at the end of that day as the result of the consumption of his wages, which, determined by the socially necessary cost of his subsistence, measure the value of his labour-power.

To me there appears to be no difficulty in understanding this part of the theory of surplus-value, which not only explains the position of the worker in the industrial organisation of modern capitalism, but is the only satisfactory explanation of that position. He is exploited just because there is a difference between the 3s. which measures the value of his labour-power, and the 6s. which measures the value he has added to the commodity—between the actual and the potential value of his labour-power.

To-day also the degree of his exploitation, the extent to which he is robbed, is much greater than is shown in this yarn illustration of Marx. The surplus-value is now much greater than 100 per cent. Many of the workers are producing not twice but twenty times the value of their labour-power, and the parasites who live upon all this exploitation are ever on the increase.

I trust I have made myself clear on this matter, but if any of my readers are not satisfied I shall be pleased to hear from them, and all having difficulties on matters sociologic should hasten to lay them before—

ECONOMICUS.

ISHMAELITES.

THE Socialist Party of Great Britain has often been charged—and rightly too—with being a party of political Ishmaelites. It is so because the only logical position in the political world that a genuine Socialist party can take up is that of opposition to all other parties. There is room for but one Socialist party in any country and, therefore, we cannot be in opposition to ourselves, and we must be in opposition to all other political parties. Thus we have to stand out clearly and distinctly from other "Labour" or "Socialist" bodies in this country. There is not one of the multitudinous array of these that we cannot at once show, by the position it takes up, to be in opposition to the principles of Socialism, and acting, consciously or unconsciously, as the catspaw of the capitalist-class. For any party that dares to claim the support of the working-class is acting as their enemy if it does so on any other ground than that of a clear recognition of the class war that is being waged in all civilised society, and that the goal of those workers who are acting their part consciously

ILLUMINATIONS.

[By THE FLASHLIGHT MAN.]

I have just been reading "Reynolds" for Easter Sunday! Goodness knows, the outlook was bleak and desolate enough as it was, with the cold, and the wind, and the rain, but after reading W.M.T.'s advertisement sheet I fairly shivered.

H. M. Hyndman had a letter in it, in which he declared that "when, if ever, the Radicals really do re-discover their root, and are ready to strive in earnest to bring about even these minor reforms of our political and educational machinery, then they will find that, though this is not Socialism by any means, the Socialists would give them their most vigorous support."

Speak for yourself, Mr. Hyndman, or at any rate only for that S.D.F. which you recently declared was "wholly destitute of political aptitude." If, in the present instance, it does not repudiate you as its mouthpiece, it will prove how just was your condemnation.

What a vast difference between H.M.H.'s minimum program now and that of the S.D.F. at the General Election of 1895, when it "ad-jured" the electors "not to give a vote even by accident to any candidate who does not . . . declare in favour of the ownership of the railways, the factories, the mines and the land by the whole people to be worked co-operatively for the benefit of every man, woman, and child in the entire community!"

It was at that election that the Reading branch of the S.D.F. issued a manifesto to the people of Reading, urging them "to refuse to cast their votes for either of the candidates of the capitalist-class, whether ticketed Tory or Radical!"

But a change has come o'er the spirit of the dream!

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds that the policy of the Reading S.D.F. in 1895 is the only sound policy for the Socialist working-class to-day.

"It is not true that the S.D.F. has ever declared that Liberalism must be smashed at all hazards" says "Justice" of April 15th.

"Justice" for July 13th, 1895, had a leading article with the title "Clear The Way." It contained the following:—"We have to go on—victory or defeat—until we have completely smashed the Liberal Party and convinced its working-class supporters that it is hopeless, and then they will come over to us in shoals and we shall have all our friends by our side and all our enemies in front!"

In the manifesto to which I have referred above appeared these words:—"For our part, friends and fellow citizens, we rejoice at the overthrow of the meanest and most hypocritical faction that ever played fast and loose with the welfare of a people. Let it be our duty to convert the defeat of the Liberal Government into a final rout for the capitalist Liberal Party."

In the same year the S.D.F. Conference was held at Birmingham, and in his opening address the President said: "Never again, let us hope, will the Liberal Party know the sweets of office and betray the people's trust. That party has been utterly routed, horse, foot, and artillery; and it is now our duty, and it will be our pleasure, to exterminate them altogether!"

"For truth is precious and divine,
Too rich a pearl for carnal swine."

"H. Quelch has never declared himself in favour of the use of the bomb" says "Justice" of April 15th last!

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

Back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be had through any Branch Secretary.

Ah, me! there are
"Deposited upon the silent shore
Of memory, images and precious thoughts
That shall not die, and cannot be destroyed."

"We must adopt any and every means to realise Social-Democracy. I am in favour of any means, from the ballot-box to the bomb, from political action to assassination."—H. Quelch at the S.D.F. Conference at Birmingham, 1901!

"I have decided not to stand for Bow again. I do so for many reasons, chief of which is, I don't agree with the policy of fighting independently, but had I the time, and were I in good health, and my business not so exacting, I should have a real good try to get the S.D.F. round to my view."—George Lansbury to the S.D.F. Executive, Feb. 23rd, 1902.

"The denial that 'such a letter' had been received was perfectly accurate and made in good faith by both Quelch and Lee," says "Justice" of April 15th, 1905.

The "denial" was made at the S.D.F. Conference at Blackburn in March, 1902. At the following Conference (Shoreditch, 1903) H. W. Lee admitted receipt of the letter, but had not thought it politic to do so at the previous Conference, and declared that under similar circumstances, for the sake of the organisation, he would follow a similar course!

"Dare to be true, nothing can need a lie;
A fault which needs it most grows two thereby."

The "Watford Critic," the Organ of the Labour Church, is conducted by F. H. Gorle (S.D.F.). According to it, "Mr. Chiozza Money's articles in the daily papers have shewn him to be a Socialist"!!!

This has almost extinguished my illuminator!

"It often happened that the manners of the members of the S.D.F. were far from attractive. If those who preached Socialism were men who could be respected, the men they wished to influence would be much more likely to listen to their opinions."—A. S. Headingley at S.D.F. Conference, 1904.

"I call him a damnable, scandalous scoundrel," (leaning towards the Alderman and shouting excitedly): "You rotten, whisky-drinking swine! You dirty, scandalous, old swine! I'll pull your whiskers!"—Recent speech by Mr. McAllen, S.D.F. Councillor for West Ham.

"Our views have been placed before the chief authorities, before Parliament, and before the Nation; they are influencing the present attempt in dealing with the unemployed question, and we shall perhaps see, when the long-delayed legislation is proceeded with, that some, at least, of our influence may be traced in the measure."—Social Democrat, April 15th.

"As to the Unemployed Bill, it is precisely what we had been led to expect, and therefore occasions no disappointment. It is utterly inadequate for the problem with which it deals, and is really an attempt to do nothing while making a show of doing something."

"Justice," April 22nd.

But what about "our influence"?

Don't enumerate your poultry before your eggs are incubated. The Socialist Party of Great Britain, at any rate, has never misled the working-class by inducing them to think that anything but capitalist legislation can come from capitalist governments.

Readers in West London wishing THE SOCIALIST STANDARD to be delivered at their addresses should send a post card to H. Hutchins, 4, South Wharf Road, Paddington, W.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

To facilitate the transaction of the business of the Editorial and Management Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to conduct its official Organ, members of the Party and other readers are particularly requested to address all literary communications to the Editorial Committee, 5, Rutland Road, Ilford, and all business correspondence, including Subscriptions and Advertisements, to A. Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months	£ s. d.
...	0 1 6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion	£ s. d.
...	0 2 0
Quarter Column do.	0 5 6
Half Column do.	0 10 0
One Column do.	1 0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1905.

OUR CONFERENCE.

We should be less than human if we did not congratulate ourselves upon the success which has attended the holding of our First Annual Conference, and the vigour and promise displayed thereat.

When, in June of last year, those of us who felt compelled to secede from the S.D.F., on account of its inconsistent and compromising policy, decided, after very careful consideration, to found a new party, whose aim it should be to raise the Standard of Revolutionary Socialism out of the capitalist mire in which it was being dragged, we fully recognised the seriousness of the step we were taking and the difficulties we should have to encounter.

But the result has exceeded our most sanguine expectations. With one or two exceptions, where personal ambition has been stronger than the desire to act loyally to the Party, the original members have worked strenuously and harmoniously to maintain our "clear and unmistakable principles, interpreted in plain and unequivocal tactics," as the Chairman of the Conference so ably expressed it.

Not the least notable of the achievements of our Party since its formation less than twelve months ago, has been the inauguration of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, which occupies a unique position amongst journals claiming to speak on behalf of Socialism or Labour, in that it is neither the private property of individuals nor owned by any limited liability company. It is owned and controlled by our Party,—hence its fearless advocacy of our principles and its unflinching criticism of all who stand in the path of Socialist progress.

Ours has been termed a position of "splendid isolation." It is, and we look hopefully to the future to justify us, recalling the words of our comrade Wilhelm Liebknecht: "This separation of our party from all other parties—this essential difference—is our pride and our strength."

The First Annual Conference of The Socialist Party of Great Britain was opened on Thursday, April 20th, at 7.45 p.m., at the Communist Club, London. Twenty-one delegates attended, representing thirteen branches.

E. J. B. Allen was unanimously elected Chairman, R. H. Kent and L. Boyne, Stewards, and W. St. John Dillon, W. Gifford and J. H. Crump, Standing Orders Committee.

The Executive report, printed copies of which had been distributed among the delegates, was adopted after a few points had been raised. H. C. Phillips and H. W. Belsey questioned the right of the E.C. to include in their report suggestions for the alteration of rules which had not been submitted to the branches. Phillips asked whether the unemployed members of the Party were included in the number reported as lapsed. The General Secretary stated that all were counted as lapsed for whom cards for the current year had not been applied, and if Branch Secretaries did not renew the membership cards of their unemployed members, the

Central Office could only assume that these members had lapsed. Belsey criticised the action of the E.C. in publishing a certain article by a non-member of the Party in the Official Organ, and Dumenil raised the question as to the propriety of selling at Party propaganda meetings pamphlets with S.D.F. advertisements on them. Pearson enquired why the E.C. had not decided to hold a meeting on the 1st of May, and it was pointed out that the Party was not yet strong enough numerically to hold a successful demonstration.

Belsey and Dumenil moved:

That any article appearing in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD which has been contributed by a non-member of the Party be prefaced by a statement to the effect that the writer is a non-member and that the Party does not necessarily endorse the opinions therein expressed.

This was defeated by 14 to 3.

C. Lehane and A. J. M. Gray were declared elected General Secretary and Treasurer respectively, and H. Neumann and D. R. Newlands were elected auditors. The Conference then adjourned.

The Conference resumed at 10.30 a.m. on Friday. The chairman, E. J. B. Allen, stated that many questions of importance would be discussed, and he felt assured that they would be dealt with in a manner becoming the delegates to the First Annual Conference of the Party. That Conference represented practically the beginning of the modern revolutionary movement in England. Capitalism had developed to an extent previously unknown. All the inventions that Science had been able to bring forth, every fresh extension of the domain of man over nature, had under the prevailing conditions only increased the army of the propertyless workers and thinned the ranks of the exploiting class. Side by side with this development there was a ripening of the workers to full class-consciousness, and the establishment of the British wing of the International Socialist Party was an event fraught with a great and glorious significance. The Socialist Party of Great Britain stood on the revolutionary principle, and was the only party of the workers in this country. It rested on clear and unmistakable principles interpreted in plain and unequivocal tactics.

The Stewards reported the votes for the Executive Committee as follows: Elected—J. Kent, 98; A. Anderson, 94; J. Fitzgerald, 88; E. J. B. Allen, 86; H. Neumann, 82; F. C. Watts, 81; T. A. Jackson, 72; T. W. Allen, 57; J. Crump, 57; A. Jones, 52; F. S. Leigh, 47; H. C. Phillips, 42. Not elected—R. H. Kent, 40; A. Barker, 37; Kate Hawkins, 36; A. W. Pearson, 32; R. Kenny, 31; L. Boyne, 28; W. Gifford, 26; H. T. Davey, 21; J. J. Humphrey, 20; A. V. Sparks, 10.

The amendments to rules were next considered, including the recommendations of the E.C. regarding some technical alterations they thought necessary. Phillips and Belsey moved:

Whereas the alterations to the rules as proposed by the E.C. have not appeared on the final Agenda, and taking into consideration the exceptional circumstances, resolved that the discussion of such alterations shall not be taken as a precedent at any future Conference.

Carried *nem. con.* The proposals of the E.C. were then adopted, with the exception that the E.C.'s definition of the method of taking a referendum of the Party was referred to the Branches, and that the establishment of relations with the Socialist Parties of other countries shall continue as one of the functions of the E.C.

THE PARTY'S ATTITUDE ON TRADE UNIONS.

E. J. B. Allen moved:

That whereas in the struggle for existence it is essential that the working-class be organised on the economic field, but whereas Trade Union organisations unless based on Socialist principles are a snare to the workers: resolved, that The Socialist Party of Great Britain does not recommend its members to belong to any Trade Union unless such Union is organised on definite Socialist lines with the Social Revolution as its object, and this Conference hereby pledges the Party on attaining a 5,000 membership to organise Socialist Trade Unions where necessary.

The Mover said that the political aspect of the Trade Union question was dealt with in the Declaration of Principles of the Party, but these organisations must be dealt with quite apart from the political position. The existing Unions were, without doubt, a stumbling block

to the progress of Socialism, because they did not unite the workers—on the contrary, in their capacity as job trusts they divided them,—and because they were used as tools in the hands of the master-class. While fully agreeing that industrial unionism should be an essential feature of working-class organisation, he held that the Unions as they knew them to-day were useless and a source of danger to the revolutionary movement.

The motion not being seconded fell through. Phillips and Belsey moved:

That any resolution adopted by the Conference be sent round the Branches as only the expression of the opinion of the Conference.

Carried *nem. con.*

Belsey and Dillon moved:

Members of the S.P.G.B. shall not voluntarily participate in the political action (*i.e.* action in relation to or dealing with social and economic problems) of any other party or organisation to which, by the unavoidable compulsion of obtaining or retaining employment, or other necessity arising out of capitalist conditions, they may belong; the payment of a compulsory inclusive contribution to any such organisation, part of which is devoted to political purposes, shall not be regarded as participation in such political action, but no member shall seek or accept office in any party or organisation which takes political action.

Belsey said that attempts had been made to draw a distinction between economic and political action, but in his opinion there was no economic action that was not also political. All working-class action taken outside The Socialist Party of Great Britain was absolutely void, and while members may belong to Trade Unions when compelled by the force of circumstances, he thought it would be well if they were prohibited from taking any office in Trade Unions under any condition. This, he held, was the only logical position.

F. C. Watts moved the following amendment:

Whereas the Trade Unions, while being essentially economic organisations, are nevertheless in many instances taking political action either to safeguard their economic existence or for other purposes, and,

Whereas any basis of working-class political action other than that laid down in the Declaration of Principles of The Socialist Party of Great Britain must lead the workers into the bog of confusion and disappointment; be it therefore

Resolved that this Conference of The Socialist Party of Great Britain recommends that all members of the Party, within Trade Unions, be instructed to actively oppose all action of the Unions that is not based on the principles held by this Party.

Watts said that up to the present nothing had been done in the Unions to reveal to their members the true basis of working-class action. The members of the party were few, but they must actively resist all unsound political action on the part of the Unions. It was impossible to form Socialist Unions at present, but the better way was to give the Party members in the Unions a definite lead, and in doing this the Conference would be doing all that was expected from it. G. R. Harris seconded.

H. Neumann said that it was impossible to separate economic from political action, for economic action was a thing of the past and the Unions were to-day taking political action. The Trades Councils and the local Labour Representation Committees were trying to get members into the local bodies and into Parliament, and the economic action of the Trade Unions was subordinate to the political. The Party could not say to its members "do not belong to the Trade Unions," because a man to get a living must very often belong to a Union; but there was a vast difference between compulsion for the sake of a livelihood and voluntarily going and helping the Unions in their unsound political action. All the political actions of the Trade Unions resulted only in the support of the capitalist-class. Our Declaration of Principles was not sufficient to cover the activity of Party members in Trade Unions, and when they were called upon to take part in the work of the Unions they should be compelled to refuse, whether the office was paid or not. The Party should prevent its members from going astray by laying it down definitely that they shall not take office nor do anything to help the Unions in their unsound position.

Watts denied that the Unions were primarily political organisations, or that the economic action was subordinate to the political. Economic action took place in the workshop, not at the ballot box.

J. Fitzgerald said that if it were true that there was no difference between political and economic action, then it was equally true that there was no difference between the animal and the vegetable kingdoms, no difference between the solid and the liquid. A thing should always be judged by its essential features, and this was the safe and scientific method. If there was no difference between political and economic action, why had it been discussed? An economic organisation fights on the industrial field alone. A political organisation concerns itself with the political or governmental machinery of the country. These were the essential features of economic and political action, and these two fields were separate and distinct notwithstanding the fact that there existed a borderland where they intermingled. There was not a Trade Union in the country that paid a tenth or a twentieth of the money towards political purposes that it did for economic action. The miners, for instance, will spend more in one strike than they will spend for generations in political action—sending representatives to Parliament. The very conditions of capitalism forced the workers to form Unions. The duty of the members of the Party was to fight against the unsound position of the Unions to-day. Craft divisions would have to be broken down, skilled and unskilled, brain and manual workers, have to join hands. The tendency of economic evolution should be pointed out, and the changes rendered necessary in the economic organisation. Trade organisation must exist to bring about Socialism, and industrial organisation would be necessary under Socialism itself. Let the members of the Party put their shoulders into the Trade Unions and carry on their work of educating straight and uncompromisingly. In this way better work could be done than by remaining outside.

The amendment was carried by 11 to 3.

Upon being put as a substantive motion, Phillips moved the following amendment:—

Delete all after "Resolved" and substitute "that this Conference recommends that no member of the Party shall hold any official position whatsoever in the Trade Union movement, and moreover recommends that all members of the Party within Trade Unions be instructed to actively oppose all action of Trade Unions that is not based on the principles held by this Party."

This was defeated by 9 to 2.

A. W. Pearson moved a further amendment:—

That this Conference reaffirms the previous declaration of the Party.

The Mover said that the position of the Party was very clear on the matter. If the Party were to oppose Trade Unions, it should also oppose the Co-operative Societies when they take political action. The Friendly Societies may also go in for political action, and then to be consistent the Party should not allow its members to join them.

F. Craske seconded the amendment, which was defeated by 8 to 6.

The resolution moved by Watts and Harris was then carried by 11 to 3.

SHOULD THE PARTY TAKE PART IN MUNICIPAL AND PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS? IF SO, UPON WHAT BASIS?

Gifford was of the opinion that the elections were the best time for propaganda, because then the people took a greater interest in public questions than they did at any other time. He suggested that an electoral programme be drawn up by the E.C., explaining the position of the Party and criticising the reforms proposed by other parties.

Belsey and Dillon moved:—

That the Party do not take part in any Parliamentary or municipal elections during the next twelve months.

Allen thought that very little could be done either in Parliament or on local bodies until the Party had a majority of delegates on them. Meanwhile, however, the representatives of the Party on those bodies should do their best in the interests of the working-class.

Neumann said that it was entirely impracticable to mention any time within which the Party should not take political action. If in any constituency there were sufficient workers to demand a representative of class-conscious principles, the workers themselves would come forward and ask for such a representative. With regard to what the members of the Party should do when elected on governing bodies, this was shown in the Declaration of Principles, and they

should support only the measures in accordance therewith. The principal thing was to get behind them a class-conscious proletariat, not Radical votes, and then their representative would be backed up in his action by those who elected him. They should be revolutionists all the time.

A. W. Pearson considered that it would take a long time before a Socialist Party man would be returned to Parliament or a local body, but when he got there he would know what to do. There were certain measures which a revolutionist could support, and he instanced the case of the Municipality of Brest which voted money to the strikers. Even when they did not put up a candidate themselves they could issue literature calling upon the workers not to vote.

Belsey explained that his resolution was not intended to prevent the issuing of literature, but aimed only at deferring direct political action by the Party for a period of one year.

Fitzgerald said that Parliament was the power that politically dominated the rest of society, and so long as it was a question of Parliamentary action there was no need for any programme at all. But it was different with regard to municipal action. The Party should contest municipal elections because it would be good propaganda, because during the elections the people took a greater interest in politics, and because the Party was out for the capture of the whole of the political machinery. The local bodies were very limited in their powers, and the Socialist position should be laid down clearly pointing out that even with a majority in power much could not be done. The capture of a municipality would, however, be a means of educating the other municipalities. Money should be voted for all possible purposes in the interests of the working-class, and the wages of municipal employees raised as high as possible, but no doubt the ruling authorities would come down on the municipality and some of its members would be imprisoned.

The resolution was defeated by 14 to 2.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AND REPRESENTATION THEREAT.

Jackson said that if they examined the British delegation to the Amsterdam Congress they would discover that it was the largest and was composed largely of non-Socialists. The I.L.P. voted for the class war resolution at the Amsterdam Congress, and afterwards scoffed at it as an obsolete Marxian dogma in their official organ.

Pearson was of opinion that the International Socialist Bureau was composed of persons opposed to the principles of this Party. The rule at the Congress was that each country must verify its own credentials, and if the delegates of the Party had refused to go into the British section they would not have been admitted to the Congress at all. They were in a minority and would have to present their credentials at Stuttgart in 1907 to the British Section.

Fitzgerald said the Conference was an International assembly composed of men of different nations, customs, and languages, and the difficulties surrounding such an assembly were very large indeed. Before it would be possible to break down the national system of representation a better education of the working-class of the world would be necessary. Different systems of representation could be adopted based upon (1) the number of members of Parliament, (2) the parties in a country, (3) the membership of the parties. The Bureau had decided that each nationality should have two votes, and when there was a dispute between two sections of the nationality they were to split the votes between them. When this was done another section in France claimed a third vote. Who is to decide and where is the question to be raised as to the rights of the parties to representation? The matter should be raised on the floor of the Congress itself. They should keep steadily fighting at the Congresses for the principle that only Socialist parties should be admitted to the Congresses. When this had been done for two or three Congresses many of the other parties would adopt that view.

F. Sator thought that a manifesto ought to be issued to the Socialist Parties of the world explaining the Party's position.

C. Lehane, General Secretary, submitted to the Conference the following questions:—

(1) Shall the Party become affiliated to the International Socialist Bureau and pay subscriptions thereto?

(2) Shall the Party demand its own delegate on the International Socialist Bureau?

(3) Shall the Party demand independent representation at the International Socialist Congress and verify the credentials of its own delegates?

On the motion of Phillips and Belsey it was resolved that the questions be sent round the Branches for a poll of the members.

Phillips and Jones moved:

That the E.C. be instructed to draw up a series of resolutions embodying the following points:

1.—That only Socialist organisations recognising the class war in theory and practice should be represented at the International Socialist Congress.

2.—That disputes between the various parties in each country as to the genuineness of their respective organisations be settled by the Congress itself.

After a few remarks from the Chairman the Conference closed at 8 p.m. with the singing of the "International" and cheers for the Social Revolution.

THE DIVINE RIGHT OF CAPITAL.

"This is the Divine Right of Capital. Look, the fierce sunshine beats down upon the white sand, or chalk, or hard clay of the railway cutting whose narrow sides focus the heat like a lens. Brawny arms swing the pick and drive the pointed spades into the soil. Clod by clod, inch by inch, the heavy earth is loosened, and the mountain removed by atoms at a time. Aching arms these, weary backs, stiffened limbs—brows black with dirt and perspiration. The glaring chalk blinds the eye with its whiteness; the slippery sand gives way beneath the footstep, or rises with the wind and fills the mouth with grit; the clay clings to the boot, weighing the leg down as lead. The hot sun scorches the back of the neck—the lips grow dry and parched; and—'Look out for yourself, mate!' with a jarring rattle the clumsy trucks come jolting down the incline on the way to the 'shoot'; then beware, for they will sometimes jump the ill-laid track, and crush human limbs like brittle icicles with tons of earth. Or a 'shot' is fired overhead, bellowing as the roar rushes from cliff to cliff as an angry bull, and huge stones and fragments hurtle in deadly shower. Or, worse than all, the treacherous clay slips—bulges, trembles, and thuds in an awful avalanche, burying men alive.

"But they are paid to do it," says Comfortable Respectability (which hates everything in the shape of a 'question,' glad to slur it over somehow). They are paid to do it! Go down into the pit yourself, Comfortable Respectability, and try it as I have done, just one hour of a summer's day; then you will know the preciousness of a vulgar pot of beer! Three-and-sixpence a day is the price of these brawny muscles; the price of the rascally sherry you parade before your guests in such pseudo-generous profusion. One guinea a week—that is, one stall at the opera. But why do they do it? Because Hunger and Thirst drive them; these are the fearful scourges, the whips worse than the knout, which lie at the back of Capital and give it its power. Do you suppose these human beings with minds and souls and feelings would not otherwise repose on the sweet sward, and hearken to the song-birds as you may do on your lawn at Cedar Villa?

"The 'financier,' 'director,' 'contractor,' whatever his commercial title—perhaps all the three, who is floating this line, where is he? Rolling in his carriage right royally as a King of Spades should do, honoured for the benefits he has conferred upon mankind, toasted at banquets, knighted by an appreciative Throne, his lady shining in bright raiment by his side, glorious in silk and scarlet and ermine, smiling as her lord, voluble of speech, pours forth his unctuous harangue. One man whipped with Hunger toils half-naked in the Pit, face to face with death; the other is crowned by his fellows, sitting in state with fine wines and the sound of jubilee. This is the Divine Right of Capital."

RICHARD JEFFRIES.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondents must be brief. Communications must be authenticated by name and address of writer and written on one side of the paper only. The writers ONLY are responsible for the views expressed.

EVOLUTION BY REVOLUTION.

COMRADE.—In the March issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD appeared an article over the signature of H. Philpott Wright, entitled "Evolution and Revolution," which, in the humble opinion of the undersigned, is a positively brilliant production—except for the fact that it is grammatically obscure, logically deficient, historically absurd, and economically unsound.

Mr. Wright endeavours to prove that "revolution" and "evolution" are antithetical or antagonistic terms, and makes this clear by using "revolution" in one place in the sense of destruction, in another as meaning "dissolution," in another as meaning a "sudden transition," in another a "catastrophic change!"

Mr. Wright avoids discussing the question Reform v. Revolution on its own merit, contenting himself with arguing that if you are a revolutionary you must aim at revolution, while if you are a reformer you must aim at reform.

But the climax is reached when Mr. Wright says or gives us to understand that the transition from Capitalism to Socialism can be effected as well by reform as by revolution; that is, in his own words, "if Socialism evolves from this system there can be no revolution, for none will be needed."

Now I, although unworthy, venture to assert that on the contrary, Socialism will evolve from this present system, and one phase of its evolution will be a revolution—the transition from Capitalism to Socialism constituting a social revolution; one essential stage in the transition being a political revolution.

Before we proceed to discuss the point will Mr. Wright please turn to our "Declaration of Principles" on page 1 and read it through carefully? He will notice that after pointing out the economic relation of the exploiting and exploited classes, the Declaration proceeds:

"That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex."

Following Mr. Wright's example I will now give a "little illustration." I was at one time not a Socialist, in fact, I was violently opposed to Socialism. For me to change from an anti-Socialist into a Socialist entailed a complete and fundamental change in my political, social, and moral beliefs and ideals—in short an intellectual revolution.

Yet this revolution was produced merely by the apprehension of one simple fact, viz., that where one section of the community own all the means of life the rest of the community are in fact, if not in name, enslaved.

The acquirement of the knowledge necessary to the apprehension of this fact and to a recognition of its importance was a long and gradual process, but the apprehension was a single and sudden mental occurrence.

What had happened? I had acquired from various sources (environment) a certain quantity of knowledge bound up with a certain quantity of prejudice and a certain number of beliefs. Addition to this knowledge entailed as a necessary consequence the destruction of a mass of prejudice and the reconstruction of social and moral ideals.

Now what was that but an evolution with a revolution as an integral phase?

From one point of view here was a continuous development; from another a destruction of one "form" and the substitution of one entirely different. From one point of view the process was an evolution; from another a revolution. And as the latter necessarily followed upon the former, we sum up the process as an evolution with revolution as an integral phase.

Much in the same way does Society evolve: for we must always remember that one of the forces whose operation produces social evolution is human intelligence. In fact, in discovering the forces producing or laws governing social development, we have to trace the laws deter-

mining the development of public opinion; and here lies the essence of the socialist philosophy first expounded by Karl Marx. I cannot do better than give his own words:

"In making their livelihood together men enter into certain necessary, involuntary relations with each other.

"These industrial relations arise out of their respective conditions and occupations, and correspond to whatever stage society has reached in the development of its material productive forces.

"Different stages of industry produce different relations.

"The totality of these industrial relations constitutes the economic structure and basis of society.

"Upon this basis the legal and political superstructure is built.

"There are certain forms of social consciousness or so-called public opinion which correspond to this basis.

"The method prevailing in any society of producing the material livelihood determines the social, political, and intellectual life of men in general.

"It is not primarily men's consciousness which determines their mode of life, on the contrary, it is their social life which determines their consciousness.

"When the material productive forces of society have advanced to a certain stage of their development they come into opposition with the old conditions of production, or to use a legal expression, with the old property relations, under which these forces have hitherto been exerted.

"Instead of serving longer as institutions for the development of the productive powers of society, these antiquated property relations now become hindrances. Then begins an epoch of social revolution.

"With the change of the economic basis the whole vast superstructure undergoes, sooner or later, a revolution.

"In considering such revolutions we must always distinguish clearly between the change in the industrial methods of social production on the one hand: this change takes place unconsciously, strictly according to the laws of natural science, and might properly be called an evolution.

"And on the other hand, the change in the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophical, in short, ideological institutions; with reference to these, men fight out this conflict as a revolution conscious of their opposing interests.

"This conflict takes the form of a class struggle.

"We may in wide outlines characterise the Asiatic, the antique, the feudal, and the modern capitalistic methods of production as a series of progressive epochs in the evolution of economic society.

"The industrial relations arising out of the capitalistic method of production constitute the last of the antagonistic forms of Social production; antagonistic, not in the sense of an antagonism between individuals, but of an antagonism growing out of the circumstances in which men must live who take part in social production.

"But the productive forces which are developed in the lap of capitalistic society create at the same time the material conditions needed for the abolition of this antagonism. The capitalist form of society therefore will bring to a close this cycle of the history of human society, as it has existed under the various forms of exploitation."—From the Introduction to the "Critique of Political Economy."

I make no apology for the length of the above quotation. Marx is too little known to the working-class of Great Britain for quotations so important to be superfluous.

It will be seen from this, what indeed Mr. Wright admits, viz., that the political, moral, and social revolutions recorded in history were nothing but re-arrangements of the relations between man and man made necessary by the development of the "material productive forces" of society (the "means and instruments for producing wealth" as the Party Declaration puts it)—in short, an evolution with a revolution as an essential phase.

One illustration from history will suffice: The Capitalist or Bourgeois Revolution in France

—The French Revolution.

Just prior to 1789 the Political, Legal, and Religious forms in France were feudal—but at the same time the feudal method of wealth production—viz., individual production by guild craftsmen, &c.—had been breaking up and giving place to the modern capitalist system of manufacture.

Consequently the class-division of society in France was not merely into rich aristocrat and poor peasant.

Firstly, there was the feudal aristocracy, lay and clerical, possessing political power and social privilege.

Secondly, there was the rising middle-class, or bourgeoisie, composed of the professional classes, the growing capitalists, and the lower strata of the priesthood—possessing little or no political power but at the same time the greater proportion of the economic power.

Lastly, there were the proletarians or wage-slaves of the towns and the peasant-serfs of the country, possessing neither political power nor economic possession.

The growing financial embarrassment of the aristocracy compelled them to submit to the summoning of the States-General. The States-General summoned, the bourgeoisie were asked for money, which they granted on their own terms. In short, they seized possession of the political power and proceeded to wield it in their own interest as the aristocracy had done.

This conquest of the political power by the bourgeoisie involved the extinction of the aristocracy as an aristocracy.

The phases of the French Revolution consequent upon the calling of the States-General, viz., the struggle between the Jacobins and Girondins &c., can only be understood as the manifestations of a class-struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, in which the latter, being undeveloped, eventually and inevitably succumbed. When the monarchy was "restored" in 1815 it was shorn of most of its feudal privileges—and the return of the monarchy again marked the victory of the landed-class over the industrial capitalist.

In short, economic evolution differentiated society into classes with conflicting interests; with the development of the economic conditions the respective political power changed and with the power eventually went the victory: an evolution with a revolution as its dominant phase.

Just as the economic change developed the capitalist-class and forced them to fight, so the working-class is developed and forced to fight for political supremacy by the evolution of society.

When the working-class shall have evolved so far that they conquer for themselves the political power, that day will mark the realisation of the Social Revolution.—Yours, &c.,

THOS. A. JACKSON.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION.

COMRADES.—After mature deliberation consequent upon the careful perusal of Mr. Philpott Wright's article in the March issue, I discover that I am, (1) an evolutionary Socialist because I concede the principle of development in society and hold that Socialism must grow out of existing forms; (2) a revolutionary Socialist because the change in existing forms which will inevitably give birth to the new order of society involves a revolution in those forms which I belong to the Socialist Party for the purpose of expediting; (3) an involuntary Socialist because I wish to revert to certain primitive society forms, though I want to retain the advantages of ages of progress.

Now according to Mr. Wright a revolutionary Socialist is entirely distinct from an evolutionary Socialist, while an involuntary Socialist is in complete antagonism to the others. So I am an irreconcilable duality on the one hand and on the other a trinity in violent opposition to myself in two places. I am also a perigrinating paradox and several other things that will occur to Mr. Wright in the privacy of his chamber, but what am I as a Socialist? I should like you to fix on a title that will explain my brand of Socialism clearly, but I cannot conveniently call myself an evolutionary-involuntary-revolutionary Socialist. Will you please help me?

FILIUS POPULI.

A TRAVESTY OF TRADE UNIONISM.

A CORRESPONDENT sends a packet of literature explanatory of the objects and methods of the Railway Clerks' Association. It is claimed that this association will serve to secure some betterment of the conditions of clerical workers on railways. It is a Trade Union for railway clerks.

Now a Trade Union is an organisation rendered necessary by the pressure of the capitalist or exploiting class upon the class they employ and exploit—the working-class. This pressure is the result of the constant endeavour of the capitalist-class to squeeze ever greater profits from the labour of the working-class, and expresses itself in the prolongation of working hours, in the reduction of wages, or if an increase of hours or a reduction of wages are not possible, in the maintenance of both in, so far as is possible, a stationary condition, irrespective of the increase in the productivity of labour.

In exercising this pressure the capitalist-class are but functioning as a class of exploiters whose wealth is derived solely from the labour of those they exploit. In combining in a Trade Union to prevent, if possible, any reduction of their standard of comfort, any hardening of their conditions of life, or to obtain where practicable some larger share of the wealth they create, the working-class are but taking the precautionary defensive or aggressive measures natural to an exploited class.

The capitalist-class are fighting to increase or maintain their powers and privileges; and as these can only be maintained or increased at the expense of the working-class, their greatest concern is to keep the latter in subjection; to prevent them improving their position, except in so far as that improvement is necessary to capitalists. On the other hand, the working-class are fighting for the best conditions they can get; to improve those conditions if possible, and to prevent them being adversely affected in any event. And as they cannot improve their position, or for that matter maintain it, except in opposition to and at the expense of the class above them, they are in necessary conflict with that class.

Obviously then, the antagonism of interest existing between these two classes must prevent any intermingling except in conflict. It would be absurd for the officers of one army to be in the innermost councils of the other. Hitherto, although the working-class combined in English Trade Unions have been very far from conscious of their class interests, a sense of hostility has kept them from fraternising with their natural enemies to the point of admitting them to an intimate acquaintanceship with the internal affairs of their fighting organisations.

The idea of employers being admitted to membership of workers' Unions has ever appealed to the most hard-headed, hide-bound and mentally atrophied trade unionist as absurd, and the clearer the comprehension of class-interests, the greater the growth of class-consciousness among the working-class, the more grotesque must the idea appear.

How then may we designate the working-class organisation that, coming into existence at a time when the antagonism of interests between the classes was too sharply defined to escape the notice of any man with an eye to see, yet admitted to the domination of its affairs, the representatives of the very class it came into existence, ostensibly, to fight. The Trade Union of the clerical workers of the railways of the United Kingdom (the Railway Clerks' Association) has done this. Its President and Vice-Presidents are of the capitalist-class, several of them company directors, with at least one railway company director.

As might be expected, the literature of this Association provides curious reading. Whereas on the one hand a number of grievances that require redress are set out and clerks admonished to combine in order to secure certain reforms in working conditions which "individualism has lamentably failed to secure for 60 years and which combination alone can obtain," on the other hand emphasis is laid upon the fact that the Association exists (among other things) to further the railway industry and provide facilities for the technical training of railway servants, which, being interpreted, seems to mean that facilities will be provided the railway clerk to become a more efficient wage-

slave what time every endeavour is being made to further the railway industry and make it a more profitable concern.

In the statement of grievances would seem to be embodied the dissatisfaction of the clerk with the existing conditions. In the statement of method and objects the still small voice of the company director is heard.

Says the leaflet before us:—"It is said that the clerks will not join a Trade Union as they object to the extreme measures adopted by most Trade Unions. . . . There is no strike and no coercion contemplated or allowed in the R.C.A."

Also:—"Membership is not derogatory to advancement in the service, neither is it detrimental to the best interests of the Railway Companies."

And again, as might be expected:—"All railway officials (and proprietors?) approve our policy."

This is the R.C.A., and a more pitiable and ludicrous attempt at working-class organisation the annals of Labour cannot show. Surely it should be obvious to the most oblique of mental visions that combination in order to secure some amelioration that individual effort has failed to secure in 60 years, implies a struggle. If some benefit is obtained as a result of combined effort, it means that force has been exercised. Those who previously refused to effect a reform have been coerced by a display of force into moving.

And yet in the R.C.A. coercion is taboo! And opposition is offered to the use of the weapon of the strike, not on the ground that the strike is an obsolete weapon in economic warfare, but on the ground apparently that the warfare itself is bad!

What then is the use of the organisation at all except as a means of bolstering up present railway administration and providing railway companies with servants more efficient at producing profit for the capitalist-class who own the railways? Why should they voluntarily assist in their own exploitation? Why should they organise themselves and pay for the privilege of organising themselves in the interests of the class that lives upon their labour?

What the workers on railways and in every other branch of industry have to recognise is that the utility of combination, economic and political, lies in the strength it gives to fight. What they have to understand is that they can only fight to the betterment of their own position at the expense and to the disadvantage of the class that exploits them. What they have to appreciate if they object to being robbed of any part of the wealth they produce, is that they will not only have to place the capitalist-class in the category of irreconcilable enemies, not only will they have to fight them as such always, but that they will have to beat them out of existence absolutely, before they can enter into the enjoyment of the full result of their labour.

And they will never do that until they understand whence the capitalist derives his power to-day—how it comes about that a handful of people are able to dictate conditions to the great mass of the people.

The workers on railways and elsewhere will have to understand that it is the possession of the land and tools of production and distribution that gives the capitalist his power. They will have to understand that the only way to break that power is to force him to relinquish his hold upon the means by which all the people live. And then they will be class-conscious (conscious of their class interests as distinguished from and opposed to the interests of the capitalist-class), and will appreciate the position which we of The Socialist Party of Great Britain occupy, and will be prepared to work with us for the capture of the political machinery of the country as the necessary preliminary to the capture of all the machinery of wealth production. Then they will utilise their strength not to treat with the representatives of the capitalist-class for the concession of small reforms, but will utilise it with the object of removing the cause of the conditions that give rise to the demand for reforms. Then they will work through their economic organisations and their political organisations for the complete overthrow of the present capitalist system based upon profit and the realisation of the Socialist Republic based upon justice and equity.—C. LAS-SWAR.

PARTY NOTES.

—O:—

WITH the month of May will open our outdoor propaganda season, and all members are expected to assist at the stations of their respective Branches in order that the best possible results may be obtained from the efforts of the Party speakers. Will all those concerned note that the Lecture Secretary is: T. A. Jackson, 408, St. Ann's Road, Harringay, N., to whom all communications respecting the Lecture List should be addressed.

Special efforts should now be made in pushing the Party Organ. The members and Branches have done well in this direction during the winter months, but this summer we should be able to increase our circulation.

Two new Assistant Secretaries have been appointed: R. H. Kent and L. Boyne. Comrade Boyne is in charge of the financial department of the Secretaryship, and all applications for membership cards, remittances for dues stamps, etc., should be sent to him. Address, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N.

The Party Emblem is now ready. It is an attractive button, hand coloured, and is to be had at the price of 2d. through any Branch Secretary.

Photographs, size 12 by 10, of the First Annual Conference of the Party, can be obtained, price 2/- per copy. Applications, accompanied by cash, for this souvenir, should be addressed to the undersigned.—C. LEHANE.

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

WOOD GREEN.

IT is some time since a report from this branch has appeared in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, but that does not mean that we have been idle by any means. In addition to our ordinary outdoor propaganda, which we have kept on all through the winter, except when the weather positively refused to allow us, we have entered upon a new departure in the direction of indoor discussions. To these we specially invite men outside our organisation, and purposely go so far as to import opposition. Not only does this seem a useful means of assisting in crystallising our more general propaganda outside, but is a necessary educational force for our members. A comrade's education, it seems to us, should not cease when he joins us, on the contrary, it is but just beginning. To this end then one of us opens a discussion on some aspect of the Socialist position, and the discussion which follows is a powerful means of developing young speakers in addition to its educational qualities. With regard to our outdoor propaganda, one is forcibly reminded of the truth of the assertion that the outer ring of London's suburbs are its dormitories, whose inhabitants only go there to sleep, for apathy and indifference are the characteristics of this huge sleeping-chamber. A revival is certainly needed here, and it shall be supplied by a strong and vigorous Socialist propaganda on right lines during the coming season, when a determined effort will be made to rouse the proletariat of Wood Green to a due consciousness of its true position.—DICK KENT.

PADDINGTON.

SINCE our last report we are able to report progress. A steady and persistent propaganda has been maintained and carried on throughout the winter. The meetings are generally well attended by members of the working-class, and a keen interest is shown in the sound and uncompromising declaration of our principles. If this continued we shall no doubt considerably increase our membership. THE SOCIALIST STANDARD has been selling very freely of late, due to a large extent to our energetic Librarian, Comrade Hutchens, who attends all the public meetings that come under his notice and disposes of a large number of copies. The current number

contains the address of our Librarian, so readers in West London will be able to obtain our paper by sending him a postcard. We have several embryonic speakers in the Branch whom we hope to develop so that they may be able to render greater assistance in propaganda work.

The rout of the bogus Socialists in our locality seems to be complete, at any rate they give no sign of their existence. The spread of Socialist enlightenment must, we are confident, convince the working-class of the hopelessness of their position under capitalism. The task we have set ourselves is the education and organisation of the proletariat, and we look forward to the coming season with confidence.—T. W. ALLEN.

FULHAM.

During the last two months we have carried on our Wednesday night meetings at Fulham Cross when the weather would permit, and by distribution of specimen copies of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD and in other ways have kept Socialism under public notice. Local labour councillors (I had almost said fakirs) have been challenged to debate, but although, or perhaps because, one councillor and one guardian are members of the S.D.F., they have been afraid to accept this challenge. Yet one of these gentlemen makes a terrible fuss when a parson declines a debate with him.

According to *Justice*, T. Wall, who stood for the Borough Council recently, was the S.D.F. and Labour candidate. But none of his posters indicated his connection with the S.D.F., or even made it clear that he was supposed to be a Socialist. He was simply the "Labour Candidate." However, this is a small matter when one knows that the S.D.F. was affiliated to the local L.R.C., and did not protest when that body pledged itself to support two Progressive aldermen in 1903 in return for support of a "Labour" man.

But though Wall had the Irish vote he did not get in, which, the glowing report in *Justice* notwithstanding, is very significant, because the Nationalists voted Progressive at last election.

Our Branch has had the compliment paid of being responsible for the defeat of the "Labour" candidate. I hope we deserve it. Meetings were run showing the real Socialist position, and a few questions were asked through the local Press.

Though small in number we are doing sufficient to cause a flutter in the Socialist-cum-Labour-cum-Liberal dove-cote, and so far we have progressed to the extent of getting ourselves well disliked by showing up some of the games of the alleged Socialist and Labour bodies, so we must be doing good. An increase in the membership and an enlarged circulation of regular subscribers to the STANDARD are some of the results of our winter's work.—E. J. B. A.

BATTERSEA.

The Red Flag is still flying in Battersea, and our meetings during the winter months in Sydney Hall and other places have been successful. On the average we have sold between 8 and 9 quires of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD each month. We have made since the Party started thirteen new members. Our Economic Class has been well attended, and through it our members have been equipped for a more effective fight against working-class ignorance and apathy. We are now looking forward to the time when we can commence operations on a wider scale outdoors. We have no fear as to future of The Socialist Party of Great Britain in Battersea. Our members are fighting all the different sections of the capitalist-class, and echo with enthusiasm Comrade Lehané's word—"Onward!"

PRESS COMMITTEE.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A.S. (Prague).—There is no official organ of the Builders Workers Trade Union, nor indeed is there any journal specially devoted to this section of the working-class in Britain. There are, of course, trade circulars issued by the Union from time to time, but these are only for members of the Union. There are, however, several so-called Trade Newspapers run by capitalists as ordinary business ventures, that deal in various matters connected with the Building Trade, but none of them pretend to be official. The two that circulate among the workers are "The Building World," and "The Carpenter and Builder," specimens of which are being posted to you as requested.

Printed by Jacob Bros., 22, Wingfield Road, Stratford, E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published by C. Lehané, Gen. Secretary, 107, Charlotte St., W.

Socialist Party of Great Britain.

LECTURE LIST, MAY, 1905.

SUNDAY MORNINGS, 11.30.

BATTERSEA, Prince's Head: 7th, H. Belsey; 14th, J. Fitzgerald; 21st, T. A. Jackson; 28th, A. Anderson.

FINSBURY PARK: 7th, 14th, 21st, 28th, Branch.

ILFORD, Broadway: 7th, 14th, 21st, 28th, Branch.

PADDINGTON, outside Prince of Wales: 7th, F. S. Leigh; 14th, F. C. Watts; 21st, H. Belsey; 28th, F. G. Thompson.

REGENT'S PARK: 7th, F. C. Watts; 14th, T. W. Allen; 21st, F. S. Leigh; 28th, T. A. Jackson.

TOTTENHAM, West Green: 7th, A. Anderson; 14th, A. Anderson; 21st, R. Kenny; 28th, J. Crump.

WOOD GREEN, Jolly Butcher's Hill: 7th, T. A. Jackson; 14th, R. Kenny; 21st, J. Crump; 28th, H. Belsey.

SUNDAY AFTERNOONS, 3.30.

VICTORIA PARK: 7th, J. Kent; 14th, H. Belsey; 21st, P. C. Herbert; 28th, J. W. Day and W. Gifford.

SUNDAY EVENINGS, 7.0.

EDMONTON, Angel Road: 7th, A. Anderson; 14th, Branch; 21st, J. Fitzgerald; 28th, F. C. Watts.

FULHAM, Effic Rd.: 7th, 14th, 21st, 28th, Branch.

ILFORD, South Park Gates: 7th, 14th, 21st, 28th, J. Kent and others.

PECKHAM RYE: 7th, H. Belsey; 14th, Branch; 21st, T. W. Allen; 28th, Branch.

TOOTING, Broadway: 7th, T. W. Allen; 14th, J. Crump; 21st, H. Belsey; 28th, J. Fitzgerald.

WANSTEAD PARK STATION: 7th, 14th, 21st, 28th, Branch.

WATFORD, Market Place: 7th, J. Fitzgerald; 14th, F. S. Leigh; 21st, F. C. Watts; 28th, T. A. Jackson.

MONDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

ILFORD, Broadway: 8th, 15th, 22nd, 29th, Branch.

TUESDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

WATFORD, Market Place: 9th, 16th, 23rd, 30th, Branch.

WEDNESDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

BATTERSEA, Falcon Grove: 10th, 17th, 24th, 31st, Branch.

FULHAM Cross: 10th, 17th, 24th, 31st, Branch.

TOOTING, Broadway: 10th, 17th, 24th, 31st, Branch.

THURSDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

BARKING, Broadway: 11th, C. Turner; 25th, J. Kent.

ROMFORD, Market Place: 18th, J. Kent; June 1st, P. C. Herbert.

FRIDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

BATTERSEA, Prince's Head: 12th, 19th, 26th, June 2nd, Branch.

KENSAL RISE, Quadrant: 12th, 19th, 26th, June 2nd, Branch.

SATURDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

EAST HAM, opposite Ruskin Arms: 13th, 20th, 27th, June 3rd, Branch.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

CENTRAL OFFICE:
COMMUNIST CLUB,
107, CHARLOTTE ST., LONDON, W.
General Secretary C. LEHANE.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Business transacted every Saturday at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W. Membership in the Central Branch can be obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—Kate Hawkins, sec., 47, Wilmingtton Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 8 p.m. at 34, Wilmingtton Square, W.C.

EAST LONDON (Central).—G. Fletcher, Sec., 305, Wilmot Street, Bethnal Green, E. Branch meets every Friday at the Secretary's address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 34, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 40, Mablethorpe Rd., Fulham Cross, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m.

ISLINGTON.—Padraig Ua Toibin, Secretary, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets every Tuesday at 8.30 p.m. at the Co-operative Stores, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—J. Kent, Secretary, 5, Rutland Road, Ilford. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Fridays in each month at 8.30 at secretary's address.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.

WATFORD.—G. T. King Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays in month, Economic Class 2nd and 4th Sunday, at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. J. Hodson, Secretary, 'Kelmescott,' Sidney Road, Forest Gate, E. Branch meets every alternate Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at the address given.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Branches and members should purchase their literature through the Party Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W. Write for particulars as to terms, etc.

CAPITAL.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION.

By KARL MARX.

(Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.

From F. C. WATTS, as above.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES.

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LABOUR.

By 'PROF.' J. E. THOROLD ROGERS.

(New Edition, Revised, Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.

From F. C. WATTS, as above.

POVERTY.

A STUDY OF TOWN LIFE.

By B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.

(Illustrated by Folding Maps, Diagrams, &c.)

(Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 4s. 6d.

From F. C. WATTS, as above.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 10. Vol. I.]

LONDON, JUNE, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

THE RECEIPT OF A COPY OF THIS PAPER IS AN INVITATION TO SUBSCRIBE.

HOW LIBERALS WIN ELECTIONS.

WRITING upon the Boer War, Mr. Dooley observed that if he had been in control there would have been no fighting. He would have conceded the Uitlanders' demand for the vote, but he would have done the counting! The Liberals are never tired of professing their desire to enfranchise the workers, but it is rarely that they make such a muddle of their schemes for depriving the workers of any use which the franchise might be to them as they did recently in Canada. In an interesting article in "The Co-operative News," Mr. Edward Porritt states that a scandal already in the courts arises out of what is known as ballot box stuffing. It was done in the interest of a Liberal candidate in one of the rural ridings of Ontario. The facts are no longer in dispute, and they show callousness to moral considerations, daring and ingenuity. The Ontario ballot boxes were most ingenious. They were provided with a double side and a trap door. With the connivance of a deputy returning-officer, some of them were substituted for the official boxes, and before the polling began they were loaded with votes concealed in the double side, and marked in favour of the Liberal candidates. The ballots were marked in the names of men known to be Tories, and when these Tories came to vote, their votes, by means of a spring, were thrown into the false side of the box, in the place of the concealed ballots, which had been passed through the trap door into the box proper. The newspapers were full of this Ontario scandal just when Earl Grey took possession of Rideau Hall.

The second scandal turns on a plot by a handful of financiers and promoters to defeat the Laurier Government, in order, it is believed, to secure from an incoming Tory Government such a revision of the Act for building the Grand Trunk Railway as would enable these men to plunder the railway by means of a constructors' company similar to that by which millions of dollars passed to an American syndicate when the Canadian Pacific Railway was carried across the Continent.

Mr. Blair (the ex-Minister of Railways) is the central figure in this scandal. While he was Minister of Railways he opposed in the Cabinet and in the House of Commons the Government plan for a second Trans-Continental Railway. On account of this opposition, he dropped out of the Cabinet and out of the House. He was made chairman of a newly-created Commission for settling railway freights and other questions between the public and the railway companies. His pay was ten thousand dollars a year—as much as the Premier receives; and it was understood when he accepted the office that he bid good-bye to politics. About ten days before the general election, however, Blair suddenly resigned his place on the Commission, and the same day it was announced in a New Brunswick paper that he was to take the stump against the Laurier Government and the Railway scheme during the few days before the polling. This astonishing news was telegraphed from St. John to every newspaper in Canada, and for a week or more Canadians were eagerly looking for Blair's appearance on the Tory platform, and for the red-hot shot which he was to fire into the Laurier Government and its railway scheme.

No such shot from the Blair guns was fired. Blair was dumb until the election was over, and since then the question has interested all Canada. "At what point and why did the plot against the Laurier Government fail?" For the Laurier Government was returned with a larger majority in the House of Commons than any Liberal Government has had since Confederation.

The question has not been answered, but much of the plot has been uncovered. It has been ascertained that Blair was persuaded to resign by a young company promoter named Russell. Blair was to have some position in the gift of Russell, worth more than ten thousand a year. Russell is almost young enough to be Blair's grandson; but he was wily enough to persuade Blair to resign and to make other plans for the overthrow of Laurier. He bought three daily papers as part of the scheme—two in St. John and a third in Montreal. It is also openly said by men whose position in Canadian politics warrants acceptance of their word that on the eve of the election three members of the Laurier Government were to be arrested for malversation in office, and that ten or fifteen Liberal candidates in Quebec were to be paid 2,000 dollars each to resign as a protest against this Ministerial scandal. They were to resign on such short notice that the Liberal organisation would have no time to nominate other candidates.

About much of this remarkable plot there is no longer any doubt. Blair admits that he was persuaded by Russell to resign, and the purchase of three daily papers by Russell is a matter of legal record. What Canada wants to know now is why Blair came back, and it wants to be quite sure that the Trans-Continental Railway construction was the game for which Russell and his moneyed associates were playing. More must come out when Parliament meets.

At Quebec, the so-called Liberal premier is so much a tool of the monopoly interests at Montreal that the Liberal Party is in revolt, and anything may happen when the newly-elected Provincial Legislature begins its Session. The ugliest incident in the Quebec election was the attempt of an attorney of a Light and Power Company—a concern with forty millions of capital—much of it water—which controls all the public utilities of Montreal, to secure re-election to the legislature. Montreal is the most monopoly-ridden city in the British Empire. It pays more for heat, light, and power than any city in the United States—not excluding Tammany-ridden New York—and this monopoly is so well entrenched at Quebec, the Provincial capital, that the people of Montreal have resigned themselves to despair.

All this only emphasises that which we Socialists persistently endeavour to impress upon the workers. As long as the means of life are owned and controlled by a class, that class will dominate all institutions, whether political, religious, or social. The only remedy for "scandals" such as these is to organise in the International Socialist Party for the complete overthrow of capitalist domination, by the only means, the realisation of the object of The Socialist Party of Great Britain.—K.

Pity for poverty, enthusiasm for equality and freedom, recognition of social injustice and a desire to remove it, is not Socialism.

W. LIEBKNECHT.

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

THE WEALTH OF THE WEALTHLESS WORKERS.

A CORRESPONDENT writes: "I am very pleased to welcome your new venture in opening a Doubts and Difficulties section in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. I think that the ventilation of all difficulties in the way of a full acceptance of Socialism and Socialist principles is of the greatest educational utility, and that this section of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD deserves the support of all Socialists. With the experience gained in this way the answers will tend to become less crudely expressed and will prove doubtless a valuable contribution to the education of our propagandists."

I thank my correspondent for his appreciation and may assure him that I am keenly alive to the imperfection of my methods of expression. The Board School education which most of us workers have received does not lend itself to the building up of a graceful literary style. At the same time a knowledge of working-class life and an understanding of its inner meaning is forced upon us as we live and work amongst our fellows. And if experience of the bitterness and misery engendered by the grinding poverty of the every-day life of the working-class is of any advantage in understanding the condition of the wage worker I think I am so far equipped for my present task.

Another correspondent has set me the following conundrum: "In your 'Doubts and Difficulties' in the May STANDARD you say that the spinner enters the labour market possessed of only his labour-power which he is compelled to sell so as to secure his means of livelihood. Is this so? Does not the spinner—the working-class—own a considerable amount of wealth in Savings Banks, Friendly Societies, and Trade Unions, and does not this fact vitiate your entire argument?"

I think we shall find that the contention in the above argument is not a sound one and that it is in fact one of the stock arguments of the apologist of the capitalist regime in favour of the present system. When the Socialist points out that thrift is impossible for the worker because his wages are determined by the average cost of his subsistence we are told that he has been thrifty as is shown by the Savings Bank deposits and that as he has been thrifty and has been able to save some of his wages they must have been more than the cost of his subsistence and that the Socialist position was therefore futile and absurd.

The first fallacy which is made in reckoning up those "savings of the working classes" is to count in several huge sums twice over. We are told grandiloquently of the £198,000,000 in the Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks and of the £45,000,000 deposited with Friendly Societies, forgetting that special provision is made by the Post Office Savings Bank for the receiving of the funds of Friendly Societies and Trades Unions. But we do not desire to press this point. We can afford—such is the strength of our case—to take the highest possible estimate and assume that these deposits aggregate £300,000,000.

The question which now arises is: Who has deposited this £300,000,000? The capitalist apologists of the press, the platform, and the pulpit assume that it is wholly the savings of members of the working-class. We contend that such an assumption is a grotesque fallacy.

Let us ask ourselves another question. Where do the small shopkeeper, the small trader, the less successful professional and business men deposit their money, and where do the children of these classes and even of the richer middle-class keep their savings?

I do not think that it can be in the ordinary

bank—whether private or joint-stock—inasmuch as they refuse to carry on their business except for the profit of the banker and that profit cannot be derived from a banking account unless a minimum balance is guaranteed. In small credit banks an average of say £50 would be required, while larger banks require considerably higher balances to be maintained.

It is not possible for the working-class to have accounts with these banks and neither is it possible for the average small trader to do so. As far as possible he requires his money to be in circulation. He uses it to replenish his stock—to increase the quantity of his goods available for turnover. At the same time the whole of his money cannot be tied up in this way. He buys on credit and has to meet his bills when they fall due and he has to save his money for the purpose. The ordinary bank not being convenient for his purpose he avails himself of the facilities afforded by the Post Office Savings Bank.

So with his children. They use the Savings Bank to put away the pennies and shillings they save from the sweet-stuff shop and often have accounts which aggregate to more than the yearly earnings of the working man.

As to the proportion of the deposits which belong to working men, I may mention the result of an investigation made into this question in the United States of America by Lucien Saniel. His conclusion was that 10 per cent. would more than cover the share invested by the working-class of that country.

In America we are informed by the Reports of the Commissioner of Labour of the United States, the average wage is 30 per cent. higher than in the United Kingdom, and we should consequently expect that the savings of the working-class there were higher in proportion than of the working-class in this country. But even taking it that the working-class here own 10 per cent. of the high estimated savings given above, the result would be £20,000,000 as representing the savings of the working-class.

I am informed further that many of these deposits are very temporary in their nature. The wage deposited on Saturday afternoon is often withdrawn the following Thursday, and the working-class in the large towns deposit in the Savings Bank to meet the contingency of rent, holiday, or even more interesting domestic occurrences.

This, however, only refers to the better paid mechanic who has a wage somewhat higher than the working-class average and can sometimes afford a holiday. Taking all the facts, I think we must take it as fully borne out that the working-class as a class are never more than a few weeks from starvation and that as a class they own nothing beyond their labour-power—their power to perform work.

While the better class mechanic getting a relatively higher wage because he has somewhat reduced the number of similarly situated mechanics competing for employment can save against a rainy day that never fails to come, the ordinary worker is getting less than the average cost of his subsistence and can save nothing.

Take the case of the worker of Ridgmount as depicted by our Comrade R. H. Kent in a recent issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. Any saving made by those workers can only be at the expense of the necessities of their wives and children. Individuals may of course save if they remain single, but marriage soon uses up the savings and reduces such individuals to the dead level of a starvation existence.

When we are informed that 43 per cent. of

the working-class population of York are living in poverty we are interested to know how the standard of poverty is understood and Mr. Rowntree is kind enough to inform us.

He says: "It is thus seen that the wages paid for unskilled labour in York are insufficient to provide food, shelter and clothing adequate to maintain a family of moderate size in a state of bare physical efficiency. It will be remembered that the above estimate of necessary minimum expenditure is based upon the assumption that the diet is even less generous than that allowed to able-bodied paupers in the York Workhouse, and that no allowance is made for any expenditure other than that absolutely required for the maintenance of merely physical efficiency."

"And let us clearly understand what 'merely physical efficiency' means. A family living upon the scale allowed for in this estimate must never spend a penny on railway fare or omnibus. They must never go into the country unless they walk. They must never purchase a halfpenny newspaper or spend a penny to buy a ticket for a popular concert. They must write no letters to absent children, for they cannot afford to pay the postage. They must never contribute anything to their church or chapel, or give any help to a neighbour which costs them money. They cannot save, neither can they join Sick Club or Trade Union, because they cannot pay the necessary subscriptions. The children must have no pocket money for dolls, marbles, or sweets. The father must smoke no tobacco and must drink no beer. The mother must never buy pretty clothes for herself or for her children, the character of the family wardrobe as of the family diet being governed by the regulation. Nothing must be bought but that which is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of physical health, and what is bought must be of the plainest and most economical description. Should a child fall ill it must be attended by the Parish doctor; should it die it must be buried by the Parish. Finally, the wage earner must never be absent from his work for a single day."

"If any of these conditions are broken, the extra expenditure involved is met, and can only be met, by limiting the diet; or in other words by sacrificing physical efficiency."

"That few York labourers receiving 20s. or 21s. per week submit to these iron conditions in order to maintain physical efficiency is obvious. And even were they to submit, physical efficiency would be unattainable for those who had three or more children dependent upon them. It cannot, therefore, be too clearly understood, nor too emphatically repeated, that whenever a worker having three children dependent on him, and receiving not more than 21s. 8d. per week, indulges in any expenditure beyond that required for the barest physical needs, he can do so only at the cost of his own physical efficiency, or that of some members of his family."

In every case the italics are those of Mr. Rowntree. Under those conditions it would be criminal for any man to try to save, and he must remain possessed only of his power to work. He must sell his power to work, which is himself, in order to live. By thus selling himself he acknowledges himself a slave bound by the will of the master who buys him. The English wage worker is veritably a wage-slave and among them is—

ECONOMICUS.

Far rather six men strong in the strength that comes of knowledge, with energies directed by a clear understanding and bent to a common purpose, than sixty men strong in nothing but sentiment and good intentions. For sentiment, howbeit a good thing when healthy, is always unstable, while good intentions unshaped by adequate knowledge, but serve to pave the path that leads directly to the hell of confusion.

PROVERBS OF A PROPAGANDIST.

THE QUESTION OF THE RATES.

AKIN with the rest of the fiscal dodges which the workers are led to take as vital issues, is the present outcry about the rising rates of the Metropolis. And whilst property owners are vehemently condemning municipal extravagance and high rates, we have "gas and water" Socialists coming to their aid by urging the extension of municipal trading, that the rates may be lowered with the profits.

The general question of taxation and the working-class has, it is true, been dealt with in No. 2 of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, but in view of the fact that there are many under the impression that the workers are interested in keeping rates low, it cannot fail to be useful to treat specially of the rates from a proletarian standpoint.

Now it is often urged that a rise in rates always means a rise in rent. If, however, we look a little closer at this matter we shall soon see how superficial is such a line of reasoning, and that, in reality, the question of the rates does not concern the working-class. In the first place, the idea that the landlord can always compensate himself for a rise in rates or taxes by an increase in rent, rests upon the fallacy that landlords can charge whatever they please. Yet it should be evident that landlords in general always demand as much rent as they can get. That is to say, they demand the full market price of their accommodation. The price land will fetch in any district does not depend upon the will of the landlord, but upon factors outside his control. Now what determines this so-called value of building land? It may be stated in brief as being regulated by the supply and demand for accommodation. This is in turn determined by the advantages possessed by any plot over land in inconvenient places on which it scarcely pays to build. Once considered, this is self-evident, for if one district has advantages over others, there will be keenest competition for house-room in the favoured district, while the fact that demand exceeds supply will permit the land and house owners to increase the rents until the special advantages of the district are neutralized by the greater cost of accommodation.

To the average person it is of little consequence whether he lives in one district or another; for although one place may possess advantages, yet the property owners therein, owing to the consequent greater demand for house-room, are enabled to extort proportionately more rent. Thus the landlords get the full benefit of local advantages. If they are asking more than this they are warned by the increase of unoccupied houses: if they are getting less the increasing demand gives them the hint that accommodation can command a greater price, and up goes the rent. If one may make such a comparison, the landlords no more choose their rent than the workers choose their wages. Both get as much as they can, and that limit is determined by conditions outside of their control. The former get the equivalent of the advantages of their sites, regulated by the demand for accommodation, whilst the latter get their cost of subsistence, modified by supply and demand for labour-power.

Where, then, do rates come in? Clearly, higher rates, as such, do not add to the advantages of a district, neither do they increase the demand for accommodation. It is therefore evident that rates do not increase rent. "But," it is urged, "rent often rises when rates do." Granted, my friends, but notice that rent more often rises when rates do not. In fact as has already been pointed out in these columns, rent has in several instances declined while rates have risen. But why does rent sometimes rise at the same time that rates go up? A moment's reflection will show why. Owing to the continual increase in population and size of towns, the circle of building land is continually extending. This means that as the demand for accommodation grows, less and less convenient, or more distant, sites are built upon. Obviously, then, the land in central and favoured districts is rendered comparatively more valuable by reason of this. Thus there is an increase in the

advantages of the favoured districts that is gradual, while to meet this rent is raised by little jumps. A change of tenants, an increase in Income Tax or in rates, is seized upon as an excuse for raising the rent. And be it noted that the rise in rent is usually out of all proportion to the pretended reason for the increase. More often, however, rent is raised without any excuse being given other than the fact that the accommodation will fetch more.

The man who farms an entire house is practically in the same position as the lodgers who form so large a percentage of the people. If during the term of his agreement rates rise, the tenant of the house is the immediate sufferer, it is true, but he is only temporarily affected, as we shall see, and in the long run the same facts may be observed if the period of observation be somewhat extended. The property owner in letting his house, gets on the average the full market price for it; and every time he makes a fresh agreement he raises or lowers the rent to meet the demand, or lack of demand, for accommodation. Many householders are in miserable circumstances, in perpetual fear of quarter-day; mere touts for the real landlord, saving him the expenses of rent collecting, house management, etc. When the additional risk, responsibility, work and worry are taken into consideration, many a householder is seen to be in a worse position than his lodgers. It is quite obvious that if rates were abolished in a district, by municipal trading for instance, the people in that district would not thereby be enabled to pay less. The landlords would at the earliest opportunity raise the rent proportionately, and would be able to do this because of the increased demand for houses that would follow such a reduction of the rates.

The question of the rates, then, is of vital concern to the property owners alone. The middle-class cry of saving the rates, or aiding them out of municipal profits, is a dodge to put money into property owners' pockets. Every effort is being made to lead the workers to believe that they will be better off by reducing the rates, and by this means the workers are hoodwinked into increasing the profits of sections of the capitalist-class. If an improvement follows some municipal expenditure, or a new means of transit is opened, the property near by becomes more valuable, and the capitalist gets the whole benefit by the increased rent or profit he is enabled to obtain. This is observed again and again, and it shows that the term "value of land" really means that the owner is enabled to extort so much value from others, much the same as a highwayman's position and arms enable him to rob all who must pass his way.

If in a few cases rising rates are quoted as a reason for raising rent, the excuse is seen to be the merest twaddle from the fact that if there are many apartments to let in a district and rates rise, rents will not go up since there would then be still less chance of obtaining tenants; whilst if the houses let well, and there is competition for house-room, rent will surely go up, whether rates do or not. Workers are misled by narrowness of view and superficial observation, and fail to realize the deeper lying general factors which are of supreme importance. In formulating a general law it is not the exceptional but the representative facts which must be taken into consideration if the law is to be a truth.

The great truth the workers have to heed, amidst the shouting of the rate-saving hucksters, is that so long as the workers must, to get a living, sell their labour-force on the market, as potatoes are sold on the potato market, so long will whatever lowers the cost of production of labour-force inevitably lower its price, aided by the increasing competition on the labour market. Thus the proletariat class reaps the benefit of every improvement while capitalism endures. The working-class has, therefore, one great enemy—capitalism, and but one hope—the abolition of wage slavery,—and that is Socialism.—F. C. WATTS.

Modern Socialism is the child of capitalist society and its class antagonisms. Without these it could not be. Socialism and ethics are two separate things. This fact must be kept in mind.—W. LEBKNECHT.

WHAT GEORGE LEARN'T.

George—"You class-conscious Socialists want too much. You ought to be more reasonable."

Frank—"Well! Socialism being justice, isn't it reasonable to want it?"

George—"Oh, yes! But you demand the lot. I reckon that half a loaf is better than no bread."

Frank—"Granted, my boy; but a whole loaf is better still. Besides, why ask for half when you want the whole?"

George—"Because I think you are more likely to get it. In a bargain both sides must make concessions."

Frank—"Must they? Well, in a bargain according to your curious plan, though the article you have for sale is worth 20/- and you want that amount, yet you would make it known that you would be jolly glad to get half for it. Do you think you would stand the ghost of a chance of getting what you want?"

George—"Maybe not; but we would get something."

Frank—"Would you? In any bargain with the ruling-class the workers' claims would obviously only be respected when the workers are in a position to take what they ask for. Therefore a bargain would be unnecessary except to enable the capitalists to stave off the workers' victory."

George—"But wouldn't you bargain with them?"

Frank—"Of course I would not. Look here: the country round a certain small town in Italy was infested by a band of brigands who waylaid and robbed those who came to and from that town. The town folk were too lazy to undertake the extermination of this band, so they bargained with the brigand chief that on payment of a yearly sum his band would cease to molest them. The brigand agreed, but feeling his power, he increased year by year his demands for money, and his insolence became unbearable. The town folk, driven to desperation, organised an attack on the brigands and finally succeeded in breaking up the band. The townsmen lamented bitterly, but too late, that they had not made war on the brigands sooner, but had instead supplied them with the means of becoming more powerful."

George—"Very pretty, and the lesson is, I suppose, that the longer we bargain with the brigand capitalist-class, the longer they will be on our backs and the harder it will be to dislodge them?"

Frank—"Not only that. Remember that it takes two to make a bargain, and if the master-class are not going to gain by it, a bargain won't come off. In fact the ruling class will only bargain when they know that if they don't concede a little, the people will take the lot. The people lose at that game all the time."

George—"I didn't think of that."

Frank—"Besides, the capitalist-class has in its pay, and can buy, the most cunning brains in the nation, whilst the workers have, in comparison, but homely common-sense. Who are likely to get the best of bargains under such conditions?"

George—"The capitalist politicians of course."

Frank—"You've guessed right. In a game of cunning or hoodwinking, the master-class, having in its pay the lawyers and commanding by its wealth the smartest wits, will always win. The workers can't play successfully at that game. But in an open political battle the workers have the advantage of mass and numbers, which the capitalists have not."

George—"I see."

Frank—"Glad you do. The workers' advantage lies on the side of an open struggle with the forces of capitalism, for in strategy and cunning the owning-class is first every time. To urge the workers not to adopt the class struggle basis of action, is to play the capitalists' game, and to deliver the workers, ready scalped, into the hands of the enemy. Now that you understand the position you will of course apply for membership in The Socialist Party of Great Britain."—F. C. W.

Readers in West London wishing THE SOCIALIST STANDARD to be delivered at their addresses should send a post card to H. Hutchins, 4, South Wharf Road, Paddington, W.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

To facilitate the transaction of the business of the Editorial and Management Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to conduct its official Organ, members of the Party and other readers are particularly requested to address all literary communications to the *Editorial Committee*, 34, *Wilmington Sq., London, W.C.*, and all business correspondence, including Subscriptions and Advertisements, to *A. Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.*

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months ... £ s. d.
... 0 1 6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion ... £ s. d.
Quarter Column do. ... 0 2 0
Half Column do. ... 0 5 6
One Column do. ... 1 10 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.

SATURDAY, JUNE 3, 1905.

A RETROSPECT.

THE 12th of June witnesses the first anniversary of the formation of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. It thus affords a meet opportunity to review our year's work to ascertain whether our hopes have been fulfilled and our efforts justified.

The formation of a new party was rendered imperative by the falling away of the S.D.F. from the paths of political right doing. Those who formed the new party had, almost without exception, been members of the S.D.F., the primary and for many years the only Socialist organisation in Great Britain. During many years of its life it had held aloft the banner of uncompromising Socialism in this country and many of us hoped that it would continue to work along the lines of no compromise with other political parties which is dictated by the existence of a class struggle.

Some years ago, however, when reaction dominated every sphere of thought—political or scientific—throughout Europe and America, new ideas were introduced into the S.D.F. by members of the organisation whose Socialism was rooted in sentiment rather than in scientific knowledge. Looking around them in the political world they saw that organisations of the half-way house character were obtaining a larger measure of support than was their own organisation. Unwitting that such must needs be the case in the present stage of capitalist development, they set themselves to the task of winning their own organisation to a similar position and to the adoption of a similar line of action. In this they were highly successful and the manner in which the S.D.F. adapted itself to its new way of looking at political events is of exceeding interest, and at a more convenient season we shall unfold the manner of its development from a no-compromise organisation to an organisation believing in and accepting entangling alliances.

The falling away of the S.D.F. from its traditional method was viewed with the deepest regret by those members of the organisation who still adhered to the ideas of uncompromising Socialism. They hoped against hope that their organisation would be recalled to a sense of its wrong-doing—that once again it would return to the true path of Socialist progress and weld itself into an organisation deserving the support of every Socialist.

Such was not to be the case. Reluctantly there was forced upon them the opinion that the organisation to which they had hitherto given a whole-hearted support was unworthy, and they

decided to withdraw from its ranks and form a Socialist organisation into which they could throw their entire energy and untiringly work towards the making it into a strong political organisation.

This then was the idea of those who, on June 12th, 1904, decided to form The Socialist Party of Great Britain. The founders were fully alive to the fact that much spade work had to be performed; that there could be no mushroom growth for the new party; that its ranks could only be recruited steadily and, at first, slowly.

And even so has been our course during the last twelve months. Parties which compromise—parties that concentrate upon one or two palliatives must necessarily have for the time a larger success than the party which seeks to build up a political party for the overthrow of modern commercial society. It is easier to gain adherents to belief in a small palliative reform than to gain them to a new philosophy based upon an understanding of the material foundation of modern industrial slavery. But in the former case the adherents are not adherents for Socialism, in the latter case they are.

Our work in the past year has been based upon a knowledge of the aforementioned facts. We have concentrated our attention upon the propaganda of our principles and to making public the fact of our existence. Our progress has necessarily, therefore, been slow and has been almost entirely confined to London where our propaganda has been greater than that of any other body. The result of this propaganda has been the strengthening of our party by the addition of a gratifying number of new members and the weeding out of the worthless elements which attach themselves to every party.

In face of many difficulties we have brought out and maintained our party organ, THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. Our paper has been written by the members of our party in the intervals snatched from their daily toil and their oral propaganda. It has met with sufficient success to warrant its continuance as an unfearing exponent of the principles of the party. As time goes on and we gather experience we shall introduce new features, and with a growing membership insure greater variety of topics than has hitherto been the case. We have had critics who have suggested alterations and their suggestions, when considered advisable, we have adopted. Further criticism is solicited.

Last August we sent two delegates to the Amsterdam Congress. While there it was borne in upon them that the admission to the Congress was too wide, and that to make it truly a Socialist Congress alterations should be made in the direction of excluding the representatives of non-Socialist organisations such as the L.R.C., the Fabian Society, and the I.L.P. in England. By no stretch of the imagination can such bodies be recognised as Socialist, and the sooner definitive action is taken for their exclusion, such as laying down principles to which the organisations must adhere, the better it will be for the International Socialist movement. We are convinced that much though not all of the difficulty which arose at the recent discussion on the bureau as to the method of representation at the Congresses is due to the fact that no principles have ever been clearly laid down to which every body represented must give their adherence.

Such rules must be sufficiently wide in their scope to admit of their universal application and must not cover matters of detail which must be modified by national conditions. This is not the time to offer suggestions as to the nature of those principles but at another season we shall return to the subject and offer tentative suggestions as a basis for discussion.

Our work and its results during the past twelve months, although necessarily limited, have, we claim, justified the step we took on the 12th of June last. The seed we sow will germinate in the future and will be reaped, perhaps, by other hands than ours, but we can see that the fruits of the harvest will be a Socialist Republic carrying with it a guarantee of a healthy human race living in a society of free men and free women—the children of the life that is to be.

PARTY NOTES.

UNTIL further notice, the Executive Committee will meet on the first Saturday and third Tuesday in each month at 3 and 7 p.m. respectively, at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, London, W.

On Sunday, 11th June, there will be held a Party demonstration at Watford, and on Monday, 12th June, will take place the first Anniversary Reunion in celebration of the establishment of the Party. Particulars of both meetings will be forwarded to the Branches in due course.

The reports to hand concerning our out-door propaganda are very encouraging, and excellent results will doubtless accrue to the Party. The idea ought to be not so much the holding of a great number of meetings as to see that a certain number of meetings are held regularly, so that the audiences may rely on hearing an address at the advertised time and place.

Socialist propaganda and unpunctuality have been largely synonymous in this country. The S.P.G.B. will change that.

Each Branch, in addition to its regular Sunday meetings, should hold at least one week-day meeting, and the young speakers should be given every opportunity of developing. Active and vigorous propaganda is the need of the moment and all other work should be subordinated to the task of conducting meetings, pushing the Party Organ, and spreading the light.

Many kind friends were of opinion that our organisation should not survive the winter, but that was because they assumed the men and women who form the S.P.G.B. to be of the same calibre as the members of other organisations claiming to be Socialist. Those who rallied to the call when circumstances demanded the formation of our organisation were thoroughly cognisant of the nature of the task with which they were confronted, and the efforts put forth during the first twelve months of its existence are but an earnest of what will be accomplished ere another summer goes by.

When obtaining handbills or other printed matter advertising meetings, etc., branch Secretaries should not fail to have included thereon an invitation to read the Party Organ. It is important that every possible opportunity of advertising THE SOCIALIST STANDARD be seized.

C. LEHANE.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

TO ALL PARTY CORRESPONDENTS.

Branch Secretaries, members and others sending communications to the Central Office are requested to address them to C. Lehane, General Secretary, and to indicate such letters as are intended to be dealt with by the Executive Committee by writing the words "Executive Committee" on the left hand top corner of the correspondence.

C. LEHANE, General Secretary.

Back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be had through any Branch Secretary.

A LOOK ROUND.

An appeal to the possessors of this world's goods and chattels has been issued, signed by a peculiar collection of side-trackers, amongst them the Countess of Kinnoull, the Hon. Claude Hay, Mrs. Clara Hendin, and Mr. George Lansbury. These good people have discovered that the employment of working-class mothers to the detriment of their children is an evil. Do they therefore propose to abolish the capitalist system which produces the evil?—to stir up the mothers and other members of the working-class to revolt, so that they can establish the Co-operative Commonwealth and properly provide for all, grown-ups as well as children? No, my friends, as the appeal states, they are "Social Reformers." The aristocratic and middle-class of them desire to show the working-class how the hearts of the upper-class beat in sympathy for the sufferings of the lower-class, and how much they are willing to do to brighten the lives of the poor. As usual, they have been cute enough to secure the help of some members of the working-class, and as soon as the funds come in Model Day Nurseries will be established.

And as soon as possible after they are in working order, and mothers are relieved of the cost of providing for their children during the day time, the wily capitalist will seize the opportunity to reduce the wages of the women.

Well, we suppose the S.D.F. and the I.L.P. can assist the employing-class to "humanise" the conditions of capitalism, if they wish. We prefer to devote our energies to changing the system. That is why we claim to be the only revolutionary party in this country.

"We cannot find much to say for a Bill which looks suspiciously like a quick remedy for the present industrial disease."

Thus the *Tory People* about the Government's Unemployed Bill, which Keir Hardie and other Labour "Leaders" are so anxious that the House shall pass. It is this thing which Hardie must know is a quick remedy that he advises the Unemployed not to endanger by marching on London!

The "tactics" question has reached an acute stage in America, in connection with the Spring elections in Milwaukee. According to *Wilshire's Magazine*, the Socialist Party there, upon a referendum vote, has decided not to contest these elections, as has hitherto been its custom. Victor Berger, recently their candidate for Mayor, explains that it is merely a judicial election, and doesn't count for much; and anyway the party can, by casting its vote for one of the old party candidates defeat one of the other old party candidates, a man who is strongly "anti-Socialist."

In comment the Editor of *Wilshire's* writes:—"Inasmuch as I had supposed that all non-Socialist party candidates look alike to us Socialists, all in our eyes being 'anti-Socialist,' I hardly see the logic of Mr. Berger's position. When the fall elections come round Mr. Berger may have trouble leading all of his Milwaukee flock back out of the old party ranks into the fold of Socialism. His tactics are most dangerous and are calculated to destroy the solidarity of our Socialist political movement."

Well said, Mr. Wilshire. It is precisely because we of the S.P.G.B. take up a similar position that we are denounced by the would-be political wire-pullers of the S.D.F. and I.L.P. as "Ishmaelites," "Impossibilists," etc. But we hold that "straight" tactics are best, at all times. A straight line is the shortest distance between two points.

After Mr. Berger's reply, however, Mr. Wilshire says:—"There may be no objection to Socialists voting for capitalist candidates when the Socialist Party has no nominee!" We admit that "may" is different to "can," but surely, in the comments quoted above, Mr.

Wilshire has given the best possible reasons why such a course should not be pursued. And so we "hardly see the logic" of Mr. Wilshire's position.

Socialists demand the abolition of the system of competition and the private ownership in its entirety, and are in politics to voice this demand, and not merely to get through any particular reform, even if that reform is so good and soundly Socialist as municipal control of street railways. The Goddess lost the race by stooping to pick up the golden apple. The apple was good and beautiful enough, but it was not worth the losing of the race. This is the Socialist position regarding municipal ownership, the referendum, and other side issues. All good enough in their way, but not good enough for us to break up our Party and let go of Socialism to chase after them.—*Wilshire's Magazine*.

At the Annual Dinner of the Woolwich Chamber of Commerce last month, Mr. Hugh Montgomery (Conservative candidate) proposed the toast of "The Houses of Parliament," and coupled with it the name of Mr. Will Crooks, M.P. In reply Mr. Crooks said that in the House of Commons there was a comradeship which was comparatively unknown in any other gathering elsewhere. In the tea room could be seen the Prime Minister chatting with the humble "Labour" member. The labour members were very much like the Chamber of Commerce, they "looked after the interests of the whole community." And so on, only more so. And this is the man whom the S.D.F. and the I.L.P. delight to support.

Mr. J. R. Clynes, Organising Secretary of the Gasworkers' Union, has publicly denied the statement made in the Executive Report of the S.D.F., submitted to the Annual Conference at Northampton, that W. Thorne, at South West Ham, is one of the Parliamentary candidates for whom the S.D.F. is financially responsible. He states that Thorne is a candidate promoted by the Gasworkers' Union, which makes itself responsible, the members paying a quarterly contribution to a Parliamentary Fund, on conditions similar to the other candidates endorsed by the L.R.C.

As we pointed out in our November issue, W. Thorne, acting upon the instructions of his Trade Union paymasters, has signed the constitution of the L.R.C., and is running as a "Labour" candidate accordingly. But the S.D.F. still claim him as "their" candidate (and they are quite welcome to him as far as we are concerned) and mislead their members into believing that he is running as a "definitely avowed Social-Democrat" as required by the Rules of the S.D.F. Pie-crust!

It will be remembered that a few issues ago we drew attention to the illogical position of the S.D.F. in opposing Mr. Masterman at North West Ham in face of the fact that at Dulwich Mr. J. Hunter Watts had voted for him and urged the local S.D.F. to do likewise. We contended that the reasons which were given for opposing Dr. Rutherford Harris by supporting Masterman could be urged against Ernest Gray at West Ham. Last month Dr. Rutherford Harris addressed a crowded meeting of his constituents at the Denmark Hill Schools, and his principal supporter upon the platform was Mr. Ernest Gray! Are our S.D.F. friends still unrepentant?

An interesting article on "James Farley, Strike-Breaker" has appeared in the *Times*. Not many years ago, it says, the need of a job constrained Farley to join the crowd of "black-legs" in a strike at Brooklyn. After this was over, he devised a scheme for keeping in touch with "blacklegs," and it is said that he has today on his books nearly 40,000 names. He perfects his arrangements for breaking a strike to such a degree that, at the moment when the employees of the elevated and underground railways of New York came out on strike recently, Farley had on the spot a man to fill nearly every deserted post, and within three days it was generally recognised that the strikers were beaten. Farley is considered to be a very wealthy man now, as the result of his

operations, and we fear he will amass much more wealth before the workmen of America recognise the futility of the Strike, as now understood, and make up their minds to strike at the ballot box—not merely for shorter hours and higher wages, but for the abolition of the wage system by the substitution of public for private ownership, democratic for class control, and production for use for production for profit.

In the article referred to the *Times* says that "labour troubles in Chicago mean war." And they mean war everywhere. A war in which the employing class are ever ready to use the maxim gun and the magazine rifle, the gatling and the gunboat, and, in fact, all the death-dealing forces of Christian Civilization against the men, women, and children of the working-class. And while even the *Times* admits that this war exists, the leaders of the I.L.P., when it suits them, deny it.

The Co-operative Small Holdings Society has issued an appeal for funds to enable it to carry on its work. Now it is indisputable that the land must play a very vital part when the reorganisation of our economic system is under consideration, but evidently this society, to quote a phrase used by Sir William Harcourt concerning the Liberal Party, "has no revolutionary schemes." It appears to be merely desirous of establishing the labourer, as such, more firmly on the soil, because "it is proved that in the few districts where allotments and Small Holdings are numerous, farmers have less difficulty in securing labourers." It therefore proposes "to supply a ladder whereby the agricultural labourer or artisan may rise from the cultivation of a small allotment to the occupation of a holding capable of contributing materially to the support of himself and his family."

It will be noticed that the Society does not aim at providing a Holding which will be capable of entirely supporting the holder, and the position seems to work out somewhat in this way. The provision of allotments and small holdings on a large scale will enable landowners to obtain more for their land than otherwise and secure the presence of a large supply of labour in districts where at present it is scarce. The Holdings will not suffice for the sustenance of the holder and his family, therefore, he must sell his labour-power to the farmer. But his holding will partly sustain him, so that he can accept a lower wage. But if he has to work for the farmer he can only labour on his own holding either before commencing his wage labour or after finishing it for the day. The net result to him therefore is that his hours of labour are greatly increased, his rate of wages is decreased, to the advantage of the farmer. This being so, it is clear that Allotments and Small Holdings offer no solution of the agricultural problem. We shall return to this matter, but cannot refrain from asking why, amongst others, the names of Joseph Hyder, Percy Alden, J. R. Macdonald, and Fred Maddison appear in the list of supporters of the Society. Why should they strive to increase the landlord's rent, the farmer's surplus-value, and the labourer's hours?

At a Conference held on Saturday last at the Passmore Edward's Settlement to consider the Unemployed Bill, Mr. J. Hunter Watts represented the S.D.F. He characterised the Bill as a wretched one, but it was better than none, and for that reason he hoped it would be passed.

Oh! what a falling off is here! It is not merely a case of half a loaf being better than no bread, but even of the distant prospect of a crumb being better than half a loaf. Which shows how easy it is to tread the downward path when once a start is made.

Speaking at the Town Hall, East Ham, yesterday week, H. Quelch stated that he had no sympathy with the working man because at one time he voted Conservative and at another Liberal. Well, this is precisely what the S.D.F. has advised him to do at different times.—J. KAY.

REVOLUTIONARY REFORM.

Two tendencies, apparently contradictory, manifest themselves in Socialist tactics on the subject of reforms.

On one hand, the very principle of Socialism is found in opposition to democratic illusions. Instead of seeing the solution of the so-called "social question" in the expansion of liberties, in the realisation of an ideal of Justice, in the perfecting of the republican regime by means of universal suffrage, Socialism declares that all the social phenomena of our days are the results of capitalism, manifestations of the class war, which will cease only with the disappearance of classes. Therefore the Socialist Party is a party of class and of revolution.

On the other hand, the desire for some immediate bettering of his lot is too well engendered in the heart of man for him to lose hope, even against all logic. Logic is weak against the power of an instinctive desire. The political parties promise reforms to their electors just as a nurse promises the moon to a child.

The Socialist Party is thus caught between the logic of its scientific principle and the universal desire for an immediate amelioration,—"something now". It cannot betray its principle, but it is likewise impossible that this party—of men—can escape this human desire for reforms.

This contradiction is, however, not without a solution, if we discriminate between the conditions of fighting and the conditions of existence of the working-class.

The condition of existence of the wage-workers depends upon their wages. It is not determined by the legal law, but by the economic law of supply and demand.

The condition of existence of the wage-workers is determined in each corporate body, by the progress of the development of machinery, the concentration of capital, the proportion of the unemployed industrial reserve army, and the stock-in-trade of merchandise.

Social realities are outside of parliaments. The crowd of ambitious folk who jostle one another in the unhealthy atmosphere of the Houses of Parliament can do nothing—absolutely nothing—to modify the real wage of the workers.

The legal law is of straw; the economic law is of iron.

Why change the tax-gathering plate if you do not change what is put into it?

Why agitate against clericalism if clericalism is a social necessity? You do nothing more nor less than substitute idolatry of the flag for that of the cross.

To dream of bettering the conditions of existence by political means is Utopia.

Although the bettering of the conditions of existence by way of political reform is impossible, it is not the same as regards the conditions of fighting, and it appears to us to be possible to make easier the struggle of the proletariat against the capitalist middle-class.

We do not here make a specious distinction. To distinguish between the conditions of fighting and the conditions of existence, is not to split a hair. The difference is real.

When a soldier marches under a shower of rain, you better his condition of existence in giving him an umbrella which protects him from getting wet, and you better his condition of fighting in supplying him with an up-to-date rifle instead of a stone-slinger.

By the very fact of capitalist production the proletariat is at war with the bourgeoisie. This struggle is sometimes hidden, at other times visible to the eyes of all, but it is without truce. Far from becoming less evident, conflicts increase daily. Some reforms would render the attacks of the proletariat more powerful, those of its adversary weaker, and would make the effort easier and more efficient.

One reform which is considered above all others as an amelioration of the conditions of carrying on the proletarian struggle is the reduction in the hours of labour.

The reduction in the hours of the working-day makes the workers mentally and physically stronger and better equipped for carrying on the social struggle. Rebels are not made of the

starved and wretched: rebellion is a luxury.

The reduction of the working-day facilitates the concentration of capital, thereby hastening the disappearance of the middle-class, making clearer the social struggle.

That is the revolutionary reform *par excellence*. It is not an amelioration in the condition of existence. Applications of the reform already made in England and America prove that the amount of labour furnished is sensibly the same: labour-time diminished, work becomes more intense. The proportion of surplus labour is perhaps greater: the 8 hours day probably increasing the relative surplus-value would thereby increase the capitalist profits.

The 8 hours day is an amelioration of the conditions of fighting—nothing more. It is an immense gain.

The moment the Trade Unions take up the agitation in favour of the 8 hours day, of which Socialism hitherto took the initiative, when "labour" elected candidates will have introduced themselves into ministerial combinations and lose all thought of economic realities in the reforms *pour rire* of which the radicals are so prodigious—the Socialist Party cannot, in my opinion, but find it profitable to direct its efforts towards the reduction of the hours of labour.

Without seeking to discover to-day what is the value of Parliamentary action to obtain this revolutionary reform, we will attempt to show in another article how it is possible to draft a law effectively reducing the working-day, because the difficulty does not consist in having a law passed, but in having it applied.

A. BRUCKE in *Le Socialiste*.
[Translated by P.J.T.]

ALIEN HUMBUG.

Of all the fraudulent measures which the professional politicians of the capitalist class ever conjured out of the fertility of their imaginations to serve as incentives to that working-class division and confusion upon which their position as an exploiting class depends, surely the measure directed against the "undesirable" alien is the most glaringly fraudulent.

How it can be successfully foisted upon the credulity of the most purblind passes comprehension. Even for the most unthinking worker the Bill has but one claim—a claim that will not bear investigation—viz, that by keeping out cheap foreign labour the opportunities for employment of English labour are increased. As though the facts do not show that the proportion of aliens to natives in England is far less than in any other European country, and that therefore practically no effective alien competition affects the chances of the home-made worker; as though it was work that the unemployed required when their condition is traceable to the fact that they have already worked too long and produced too much; as though the capitalist-class would shut out cheap labour and therefore the larger profits for which they hunger. The cheap labour of women and children is an infinitely more effective competitor in the labour market to-day, and even were it not the development of capitalism and the higher organisation of industry must add to the quantity of redundant labour, must make the competition for work more keen, must operate to keep the price of labour-power (wages) from rising above sufficient for bare subsistence.

That is the matter for the consideration of the workers of this country. And when they have grasped the significance of it they will recognise why it is that the capitalist-class, through their political mouthpieces, parade their Alien Bills and other legislative flummery alleged to be designed to serve working-class interests. They will find, curiously enough, that such measures invariably coincide with working-class unrest, with such periods as when the pressure of exceptionally adverse circumstances tends to excite the unhappy worker out of his customary lethargy. And they will find upon further enquiry, that every such measure is an elaborate "fake" from their point of view.

When that time comes they will see the reason for the existence of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and will join it as the only party in England to-day translating its knowledge of the working-class position into consistent political action.—A.G.

BOOKS AND BOOKLETS.

THE CITIZENSHIP OF WOMEN—is the latest pamphlet from the pen of Mr. Keir Hardie, and within its covers are probably all the few arguments that can be adduced by the supporters of what is known as the Limited Franchise Bill for Women. Its chief value, however, lies in the fact that it emphasises the back-door and step-at-a-time (the smaller the better) methods which find favour in the sight of Mr. Hardie's I.L.P. Thus:—

"Once women are admitted to citizenship and some women become voters, the male mind will insensibly accustom itself to the idea of women citizenship and the way be thus prepared for adult suffrage complete and unrestricted."

The same writer recently gave it as his opinion that Socialism would probably come as a thief in the night, and it is not extraordinary to find the same argument being used in regard to an alleged step that was used in regard to the ultimate object of that step. But to the man who understands that the first postulate of Socialism is the existence of a class-conscious and well organised proletariat whose every step towards emancipation must be taken with eyes wide open, Mr. Hardie's position is grotesque.

If Mr. Hardie and the I.L.P. hold that the only way for the workers lies in the unconscious absorption of these alleged preliminaries to Socialism, obviously their duty to themselves and to the workers is to ensure that the process shall be unconscious. Because clearly if the workers have their suspicions aroused by the clumsy administration of an overdose, they may on the one hand do themselves an irreparable injury by refusing to acquiesce in a measure designed to benefit them, and on the other, summarily and ignorantly, seal the fate of the I.L.P. that to-day trembles in the balances. Therefore the course Mr. Hardie should adopt in this matter of the enfranchisement of women, is to reduce the persons immediately affected by the measure to the lowest possible minimum. Let it embrace the wives of, say, dukes only, and let it be smuggled through if possible without fuss and under some other guise by someone who cannot be accused of sympathy with the working-class. Thus a commencement will have been made, and the principle, which is to have such beneficial and far-reaching effects upon working-class life and outlook, will have been conceded, and, before the male worker who, according to Mr. Hardie, "will not lightly or all at once part with the authority which has so long been his, and admit that the wife of his bosom is his political equal," will have awakened to the fact that his authority has been weakened, his mind "will have accustomed itself to the idea of women citizenship and the way will have been prepared for complete adult suffrage."

Really one would think from a perusal of Mr. Hardie's pamphlet that the extension of the franchise to women was a matter of the first importance. The fact is, of course, that to-day the working-class have sufficient political power to do pretty much as they like. Unfortunately they like to return the Liberal or Tory or booby Labour man. The reason they like to do that is because they do not know how to use their power. And they have failed to understand largely because reformers, with the best of intentions maybe, have worked upon the untenable assumption that the average mind is not capable of taking a grip on the whole Socialist position and have so omitted to tell the whole truth. While the workers do not know the whole truth they cannot understand, and while the mental activity they can spare is harnessed to and expended upon, attempts at altogether ineffectual reforms, they never will.

The pamphlet is prefaced by a character sketch of the author by W. T. Stead.—A.J.M.G.

"Harkins," said old Barlow to his foreman, "the firm has decided to inaugurate a system of profit sharing with the employees."

"Good! What were the profits last year?"

"Last year we lost twelve thousand pounds. That necessitates a cut of 10 per cent. in wages under the new system. Tell the men the new arrangement comes into effect immediately."

CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondents must be brief. Communications must be authenticated by name and address of writer and written on one side of the paper only. The writers ONLY are responsible for the views expressed.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION.

DEAR COMRADE,—Ignoring Mr. T. A. Jackson's opening remarks on my article, "Evolution and Revolution," I will come at once to his first point.

He complains that in one place I use the word "revolution" in the sense of "destruction," in other places as meaning "dissolution," "sudden transition," and "catastrophic change." Quite right, I do; but, what is more surprising, Mr. Jackson himself runs me pretty close in so defining the word, for after giving a brief account of his experience he says:—

"The acquirement of the knowledge necessary to the apprehension of this fact and to a recognition of its importance was a long and gradual process, but the apprehension was a single and sudden mental occurrence."

If that does not mean a sudden transition, what does it mean? A little further on your correspondent says:—

"From one point of view there was a continuous development; from another a destruction of one form and the substitution of something entirely different."

Had Mr. Jackson proceeded much further he would doubtless have introduced the other definitions to which he appears to take exception—dissolution, and catastrophic change; the former, by the way, being one of the definitions of "destruction."

As it is, however, the comrade has practically conceded all I asked in that direction. Revolution is a sudden transition from one form to another; it is destructive to the old, and stands as base to something entirely different. So far we agree. Now as to evolution.

In the article Mr. Jackson so ably criticised these words occur:—

"The change revolution produces may of course go on evolving, but we must not forget that revolution brought that particular phase of evolution into existence."

Here is my meaning:—

Man, it is affirmed, has evolved from the ape, but he is not an ape. Socialism, as we understand it, has evolved from the capitalist system, but it is not the capitalist system. Therefore, I hold that Socialism is not evolution leading up to revolution, but revolution in the process of evolution; that is, revolution evolving to its final consummation.

The theory of Socialism being revolt against present institutions, it must of necessity be revolution in the making; in other words, evolving revolution. Being so, it must, while fostering its own development, regard all similar developments with more or less hostility, proving that revolution is antagonistic to all forms of evolution but its own.

Without that revolutionary principal in our midst, no revolution, as we now use the word, could occur. That is to say, left to evolve without the revolutionary force behind it, the capitalist system could not evolve up to a revolution, only in the sense of a change produced by the lapse of time. The two systems being antagonistic, one could never evolve directly from the other, any more than a young tiger could evolve into a gazelle.

I submit that Mr. Jackson mistakes the nature of the force governing his conversion. When he first began to take a live interest in Socialism, he was immediately in the throes of an intellectual revolution; consequently, his evolution up to a full apprehension of what Socialism means had a revolutionary base, without the aid of which Mr. Jackson would never have been a Socialist.

Is it not evident that as Socialism is revolutionary, all Socialists must evolve from that revolutionary base? From the point of view of their ideal they have cut off all connection with the present system; standing, as an embodiment of revolution, in direct hostility to that system. If this is not correct, how is it that the present system does not evolve every man into a Socialist? It is apparent that men

must grasp the revolutionary principle before they can evolve into Socialists.

The capitalist system is complete in itself. The theory of Socialism is complete in itself. Each is controlled by a distinct and hostile evolution. The one is established; the other seeks to take its place. Each constitutes a system in process of evolution; the one evolves with preceding revolution as base, the other evolves upon its own base, and when the time is ripe, will step in as a complete and new revolution, so cutting off the further evolution of the old.

If these two forces are not antagonistic, I should like to know where we are to look for antagonism.

Should these conclusions be correct, there is nothing illogical in certain Socialists calling themselves "Evolutionary Socialists" in contradistinction to the Revolutionary. They are evolving Revolutionists, believing that they can apply their principle of revolution a "bit at a time," so gradually bringing about the realization of their ideal.

In the extract which your correspondent gives from Karl Marx, it will be noted that the great economist discriminates between evolution and revolution.

The former, he observes, "takes place unconsciously, strictly according to the laws of natural science." Of the latter he says, "Men fight out this conflict as a revolution, conscious of their opposing interests."

Therefore, without the revolutionary principle you cannot get the proletariat class-conscious. Evolving with the present system, they can never become class-conscious in a Socialist sense. They must step across the borders where revolution awaits them.

Mr. Jackson, like many another, had a hard fight with his doubts and prejudices, but being conscious of this, he was, as I have said, from the very first in the throes of an intellectual revolution. His new ideas, the instruction he received, did not come to him directly from the present system, but from the revolutionary impulse at work within that system. The comparison enabled Mr. Jackson to choose; his sense of justice enabled him to choose rightly. That, I submit, is the secret of the mental process he describes.

But introspective reasoning is always defective, for the experiences of any two men rarely agree. For instance, the experience of a young man who from his infancy had been brought up as a Socialist, would be quite different to that of Mr. Jackson; for where, in such a case, would come in "an evolution with a revolution as an integral phase"?

Again, suppose a man who was formerly a Socialist were to change his political belief and join one of the present political parties, would Mr. Jackson call this a revolution? I am inclined to think our friend would call that man a Reactionary, not a Revolutionist. A man must change from the orthodox to the revolutionary before he can be regarded as a Revolutionist. From this base he stands as an individual personification of Revolution, ready to play his part in putting a period to the further evolution of the thing to which he is opposed.

Therefore, a complete change of opinion, as such, does not constitute a revolution, as Mr. Jackson appears to argue.

I am not trying to score points against Mr. Jackson or anyone else, my sole desire being to lessen the confusion apparently prevailing as to the "true value and relative application of the words evolution and revolution."

I could say much more upon the subject, but noticing that you ask for brief communications I will close with a few words in reply to your correspondent, Filius Populi.

I am sorry to say I cannot dispute his statement that he is a "peregrinating paradox and several other things." The truth of his sad admission is only too apparent. He wants to know what he is as a Socialist. A ghastly failure, I should say, for a man afflicted with such a decided kink in his cerebrum could scarcely be a success. However, let him take courage: with study and persistent application he may presently begin to understand things.

He requests you to fix on a title that will explain his brand of Socialism clearly. If you decide to oblige him you have some tall thinking ahead. But as he pleads so pathetically for your

help, I trust you will not withhold it altogether. May I suggest, however, that you refrain on this occasion from calling a spade a spade. You might hurt friend Populi's feelings. May I also suggest that you make your answer as elementary as possible.—H. PHILLIPS WRIGHT.

The accident of a call at the Editorial address coinciding with the receipt of Mr. P. Wright's letter enables me to pen a line designed to appear in company with Mr. Wright's latest contribution to the confusion of terms. I leave the task of straightening out Mr. Wright's unhappy tangle to Jackson, moderately confident of his ability to deal with it expeditiously and effectively with no great mental exertion, and confine myself to pointing out with becoming humility, that Mr. Wright has shunted his responsibility in the matter of finding a name satisfactory to himself for the Socialist who is at once evolutionary, revolutionary, and involuntary in the definition I set upon the words, upon the shoulders of a long suffering editorial committee.

It was, of course, natural that Mr. Wright should endeavour in that way to unhook himself from the triple-horned dilemma upon which he so ably, howbeit unconsciously, transfixed himself, but I think he might have assisted the Editorial Committee with one of those scintillating inspirations that characterized his first letter and set the Party membership agog. We should then have again seen how far Mr. Wright can be wrong in his conception of what a Socialist should hold. I invite him most cheerfully to be quite ruthless of my feelings: they don't matter. Let him call a spade a spade. It will be wonderful to hear him speak clearly, although I fear he will get a hoe somehow woven into his definition. And then I will retire into my wonted obscurity with a full heart.

FILIUS POPULI.

P.S. My conscience smites me. I fear I ought not to lure Mr. Wright into the position of a butt for derision. He didn't know—how could he?—that all Socialists are evolutionary, revolutionary, and involuntary to the extent suggested in my note. He didn't know—how could he?—that the "Dear Comrades" he fraternally addresses are "ghastly failures" to a man. Ah me! these intellectuals!—FIL. POP. (not PHILPOT)

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

WATFORD.

Last month we were, according to a certain "organ of Social-Democracy," financially ruined for months to come. We had also been "effectually disposed of" by—of all the good and harmless persons in the world—Mrs. Jarvis! who, together with other champions of irreconcilable and uncompromising class consciousness (S.D.F. brand), did their little best to help return candidates in whose programmes the eye of Faith, peering through the most perfect of microscopical appliances, would have failed to discover a distinctive labour characteristic, and who appealed piteously for votes on the ground that they would look after "the best interests of all"! Yet we have quite cheerfully commenced to financially ruin ourselves some more by running a series of meetings in the Market Place on Sunday evenings, at which we shall be pleased to welcome S.D.F.'ers or what-not, and to make clear how well Mrs. Jarvis (or whoever was responsible) has succeeded in deluding the writer of the note referred to into believing (if indeed he did believe) that we were disposed of. Nothing, says the report of the S.D.F. oracle, was spoken but undiluted Social-Democracy. Thus:—

We want the children brought up with wills free and strong in the image of God.

Socialism means the abolition of idlers at both ends of the scale.

Socialism means a fair return to the workers for their labour.

Etc., etc., ad nauseum. Samples of diluted Social-Democracy would be interesting.

We took the opportunity the elections presented to distribute some thousands of a special pamphlet dealing with the local situation. Of course the wrath of our "labour leaders" was

aroused, but they will doubtless recover. We are quite ready to justify our action on the public platform as they well know, and that is probably why they give our public platform a wide berth.

The Raunds strikers passed through this town twice. The "Labour" Party supplied tea the first visit. The Liberal Party did ditto the second. Effect—confusion worse confounded.

And there are so few of us to clear the issue and keep it clear. But we go forward doing all a few men may, knowing that the future is with us; that we hold the key to the door through which the workers must pass to their emancipation. And it is well.—THE BRANCH.

ISLINGTON.

We have emerged from winter-quarters and initiated our 1905 open-air campaign. On May 7th we had an excellent meeting in Finsbury Park, with plenty of questions and opposition, 50 copies of the Party Organ sold and a good collection. A local supporter of Mr. Percy Alden, Liberal and Labour Candidate for Tottenham, challenged us to debate. We at once closed with the offer, and on Sunday, 14th, the encounter took place. An *ex parte* statement that we had the best of it may scarcely be a fair way of putting it, but at any rate the meeting was large, so was our collection, and again we sold 50 copies of our paper. On the following Wednesday we engaged the enemy at Highbury Corner, and forced the representatives of the local I.L.P. to accept a challenge to debate, which comes off on Wednesday, 24th May. This will afford us a good opportunity of exposing the pretensions of those who are trying to resuscitate the I.L.P. in Islington, and of exhibiting in their true colours the *mar-eadh* Socialists. In Islington, as in other parts of this country, those who call themselves Socialists can be divided into two classes, *viz.*, those who believe in Socialism and those who don't. It is our business to get those who believe in Socialism to join the S.P.G.B. and to keep those who don't outside until they learn something of the science of working-class politics. At Highbury Corner two men came forward to join our party. On Sunday, 21st May, we were again in evidence in the Park where we held a large audience for two hours. One new member handed in his name, 50 copies of our Organ sold, and a good collection taken up. It is only fair to mention that no other organisation claiming to be Socialist has held an audience in Finsbury Park for the last three Sundays, although they have held meetings. We don't mind this in the least. Soon the workers on Islington's heights will realise that the S.P.G.B. is the only party of the workers. *Soghal fada dho!*—CONCHUBHAR.

ROMFORD DIVISION.

We congratulated ourselves upon the result of our first Sunday morning meeting this season, but our success was also our undoing. We had a large audience, sold over two dozen STANDARDS, and had many questions and some teetotal opposition. But the police discovered that the meeting was a danger to the electric trams, or that the trams were a danger to the meeting, or something to that effect, and when we again essayed to hold a meeting in Ilford Broadway on the following Monday evening, the "force" prohibited it, and we were perforce compelled to seek a fresh location. But we shall make a good station of this by sticking to it and not disappointing our audiences. There is no question about the interest displayed by the public in our position. It is to them a welcome change from the attempts to confuse Socialism with Christianity and the perpetual glorification of municipal profit-mongering to which the speakers of a local "Socialist" body mainly devote themselves, what time they are not supporting Liberals for municipal elections. We have held meetings in Romford and Barking, and hope in the latter town to revive that revolutionary spirit which the confusing tactics of the S.D.F. turned Labour Fakir politicians have almost crushed out.

At the last General Election the S.D.F. supported the Liberal candidate in this division, but we have made it quite clear that we shall oppose them all. We are not of those who advise the working-class to vote for their class enemies and then blame them for the result.

TEAR'EM.

Socialist Party of Great Britain.

OPEN-AIR MEETINGS.

SUNDAY MORNINGS, 11.30.

BATTERSEA, Prince's Head.
FINSBURY PARK.
ILFORD, Roden Street, Ilford Lane.
PADDINGTON, outside Prince of Wales.
REGENT'S PARK.
TOTTENHAM, West Green.
WOOD GREEN, Jolly Butcher's Hill.

SUNDAY AFTERNOONS, 3.30.

VICTORIA PARK.

SUNDAY EVENINGS, 7.0.

EDMONTON, Angel Road.
FULHAM, Effic Rd.
ILFORD, Seven Kings Station.
PECKHAM RYE.
TOOTING, Broadway.
WANSTEAD PARK STATION. (7.45)
WATFORD, Market Place.

MONDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

ILFORD, Roden Street.

TUESDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

WATFORD, Market Place.

WEDNESDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

BATTERSEA, Falcon Grove.
TOOTING, Broadway.

FRIDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

BATTERSEA, Prince's Head.
KENSAL RISE, Quadrant.

SATURDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

EAST HAM, opposite Ruskin Arms.

These meetings will be addressed by the following:—

E. J. B. Allen, T. W. Allen, A. Anderson, H. Belsey, G. C. H. Carter, J. Crump, J. W. Day, J. Fitzgerald, W. Gifford, P. C. Herbert, T. A. Jackson, J. H. Kennett, R. Kenny, J. Kent, C. Lehané, F. S. Leigh, F. G. Thompson, F. C. Watts.

WEST HAM.

ENTHUSIASM is working wonders in West Ham. We are having good and attentive audiences, both here and in East Ham, in the former case drawn chiefly from those to whom it is necessary to break the news very gently that they also are of the working-class, but so far we have had no fatality. The worst of messing about with ink, worrying over details of profit and loss, and looking like bosses is that it leads to so many cases of mistaken identity. Many are wroth to find that the profits are somebody else's while the losses are theirs. The local "squints" continue to shape their course by the rule of "don't let 'em see any red, Sir!" but there are signs of mistrust of those who see round corners. Especially is this the case in East Ham, where we hope to establish a branch almost immediately.—A.E.J.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

H. T. DEE—The article printed in this issue over the name of F. C. Watts should dispose of your difficulties.

J. C. R. (Soham).—Many thanks for extract and circulars. If our comments on the latter are not justified, our columns are open. *Audi alteram partem.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.—Articles from E. J. B. Allen, H. Davey and J. H. Kennett. Exchange List. "The Socialist Voice" (Oakland, California).

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

CENTRAL OFFICE:
COMMUNIST CLUB,
107, CHARLOTTE ST., LONDON, W.
General Secretary C. LEHANE.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Business transacted every Saturday at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W. Membership in the Central Branch can be obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—Kate Hawkins, sec., 47, Wilmingtong Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmingtong Square, W.C.

EAST LONDON (Central).—G. Fletcher, Sec., 305, Wilmoft Street, Bethnal Green, E. Branch meets every Friday at the Secretary's address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 34, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 49, Mablethorpe Rd., Fulham Cross, S.W. Branch meets alternate Mondays at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Thursday at 8 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—Padraig Ua Toibin, Secretary, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets every Tuesday at 8.30 p.m. at the Co-operative Stores, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—J. Kent, Secretary, 5, Rutland Road, Ilford. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Fridays in each month at 8.30 at secretary's address.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.

WATFORD.—G. T. King Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays in month, Economic Class 2nd and 4th Sunday, at 3 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Park Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at Spiritualist Hall, 32, Dames Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Branches and members should purchase their literature through the Party Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W. Write for particulars as to terms, etc.

CAPITAL.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION.

By KARL MARX.
(Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.
From F. C. WATTS, as above.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES.

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LABOUR.
By PROF. J. E. THOROLD ROGERS.

(New Edition, Revised, Published at 10/6.)
Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.
From F. C. WATTS, as above.

POVERTY.

A STUDY OF TOWN LIFE.
By B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.
(Illustrated by Folding Maps, Diagrams, &c.)
(Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 4s. 6d.
From F. C. WATTS, as above.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 11. VOL. I.]

LONDON, JULY, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Readers who can endorse the foregoing in its entirety are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the nearest Branch or with the General Secretary. See Directory, page 8.

INVASION OR STARVATION?

The man in the street is comforted. If ever he had any doubts concerning "his" country's preparedness for and protection against any possible invasion of this tight little isle, these have been entirely dispelled by Mr. Balfour's recent speech in the House of Commons. Not only have "we" sufficient battleships, not only are they up-to-date, but in the moment of danger they could be so quickly mobilized at any given spot that there exists no necessity for uneasiness. And so our friend of the short sight, who discerns nothing beyond the tip of his nose, is reassured, and proceeds to his daily avocation briskly, humming—

"We don't want to fight,
But by Jingo if we do!
We've got the ships,
We've got the men,
We've got the money, too!"

It is true that some of our largest battleships have a nasty habit of ramming each other now and again, that our torpedo boat destroyers sometimes buckle, that in about twelve months three of our expensive submarines have come to grief with much loss of life to our own men, and that our guns sometimes burst, hurling our handy-men into the great unknown. These are mere incidents, or such accidents as will happen in the best regulated navies. Balfour says "all's well." Campbell Bannerman congratulates him upon his statement, and the pleased patriot perigrinates, at peace with all the world.

Someone has remarked that the Britisher cannot concentrate upon more than one thing at a time, a failing of which the "statesman," of both the capitalist and "labour" order, has not been slow to take advantage. Hence it happens that the great "B.P." rarely concerns itself with the substance, so intent is it in grasping the shadow. In the present connection, John Bull, entirely failing to note the economic development of recent years, still imagines that the enemy against whom it is necessary to guard is a foreign navy or a combination of foreign navies, ever on the watch to swoop down upon these shores. This may have been the position many years ago, when we produced our own foodstuffs, and "every rood maintained its man." But with the development of manufactures, to the detriment of agriculture, a new foe has arisen. It is not the foreigner with his ships of war that we have to fear and to fight, but that product of capitalism, the financier, of no nation and of every nation, whose operations could at any time not only inflict severe hardships upon the people of this and every other country, but could bring Britain to its knees by withholding its food supplies.

Fifty years ago, during the financial year 1854-5, 20,546,000 quarters (of 480 lbs.) of wheat and wheat flour were consumed here, of which 17,563,000 quarters were home grown and only 2,983,000 were imported. At the time of writing, I am unable to obtain the exact year when we ceased to be self-supporting as far as foodstuffs are concerned, but it certainly must have been long after the commencement of the 19th century. An article which appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine* for February, 1903, contained a Declaration signed by 26 of the leading

corn merchants of the United Kingdom, in which it was stated that "as late as the Crimean War we were almost self-supporting but we now import four-fifths of our wheat."

As this article showed, there are some among the capitalist-class who view with alarm our present dependent position, but the proposals they put forward are, as might be expected, totally inadequate. They do not desire the emancipation of the wage-earning class and therefore advocate nothing that would tend in that direction.

In 1898 a Committee was appointed "to inquire and report how far, and in what way, the proposed establishment of national stores of wheat would affect the interests of British Farmers." It consisted of M.P.'s and others, all supposed to possess a practical knowledge of agricultural matters, and the most important of their conclusions was, "It may be concluded, therefore, that for six months after the end of March in any year, the quantity of wheat and flour in the country seldom exceeds six weeks' supply." To-day we are more dependent than ever upon other countries, because our population has increased, whilst the home area under cultivation has considerably decreased.

With the recollection of the recent Daiter-Armour manipulation of the world's wheat supply let us look the facts squarely in the face. Is it possible invasion or probable starvation that we free-born Britishers have to prepare for?

Some of those who gave evidence before the Agricultural Committee seemed to get very near to the truth, but just failed to grip, or to admit, the exact situation. Mr. James Birch thought that "in the event of war we should be practically in the hands of the plunging speculator," but is war a necessary condition? Mr. T. B. Horne spoke of "the perilous position this country would be placed in for its food supply, should a combination of nations against Great Britain arise," but substitute determined financiers or plunging speculators for "nations" and the peril is as great and probably the action would be more rapid, the effects more immediate and disastrous. Some of the witnesses admitted that "apart from a forcible interruption of supplies by enemies' cruisers, there is a possibility that a nation—or a coalition of nations—intending to make war on this country might forestall the supply of wheat by the purchase of futures." Mr. Proctor could quite imagine that "if Russia to-day were to be at war with us, our own supplies (from Russia) would be stopped, and, through German and other sources, she might buy, in America, practically all the American wheat." And Mr. Seth Taylor, in reply to a question respecting the engine of offence which would be used by those countries unable to compete with us on the seas, answered "they have nothing to do but sit on their stocks."

Let us put it in another way. Apart from a forcible interruption of supplies by enemies' cruisers, there is a possibility that a millionaire—or a coalition of millionaires—intending to bring this country to submission, might forestall the supply of wheat by the purchase of "futures." Not in any way a remote or improb-

able contingency. According to the article in *Blackwood's*, "the chief source of our supply is the United States, but the price of wheat on the American corn market can be raised artificially, and in the event of a European war, in which Great Britain was involved, it is quite possible, indeed probable, that it would be so raised." And it could also be so raised, as has already been done, without a European war, as the working-class have good cause to remember.

When Mr. Joe Leiter, Lord Curzon's brother-in-law, attempted the cornering of the world's wheat supply, the capitalist Press said that he failed, but viewed as a failure, the effect upon the working-class was so disastrous that one can imagine what would have been the result had he succeeded. Not only did the price of wheat, flour and bread rise all over the world, but the inability of the workers in some parts of Southern Europe to obtain bread led to riots, and in Hungary the people, demanding bread, were given the usual capitalist answer—bullets. If, then, the operations of one man in Chicago, or, counting Armour, two men, could produce such world-wide results when those operations were supposed to have failed, it is easy to see that a combination of financiers could dictate their own terms, particularly to a country so dependent upon outside sources for its food supply as is Great Britain.

The proposals usually put forward are useless, because they all depend upon the continuance of the competitive system.

There is the tariff reformer, who, by a re-adjustment of fiscal conditions, would induce the growing of the Empire's food supply within the Empire, but who can never show (I myself have challenged several) how that will prevent the financiers operating. Love laughs at locksmiths and Leiter, Armour, Rockefeller & Co. would laugh at tariff walls if they determined to get control of the food supply of this Empire or of any other part of the world.

The establishment of national granaries would not only not affect them but by creating an extra demand for the twelve month's supply of wheat which it is proposed to store, would give the "plunging speculator" his opportunity.

Then there is the reformer, sometimes claiming to be a "Socialist," who advocates small holdings or peasant proprietorship, either because he thinks, with the late Lord Salisbury, that "to increase the number of small holders of the soil is to secure the strongest bulwark against revolutionary change," or because he honestly believes that to be the best proposal. But apart from the fact that the day of small things is past, that production on a small scale is wasteful, it is well known that the transformation from a tenant to a small proprietor, whilst freeing the cultivator from the domination of the farmer or landlord, drives him into the clutches of the usurer. What has the tenant farmer of Ireland gained? Is it better to be the victim of the gombeen man than of the landlord? And none of the other proposals would be effective. What is wanted and what alone will suffice is a complete revolution. The class-proprietaryship of the means of life must be abolished: they must be taken over and controlled by the people, all of whom shall be workers. With the substitution of common for private ownership of land, factories, railways, etc., the power of the capitalist, great and small, of gambling with the people's food, of appropriating the product of the labourer, whether on the field, the mine or the workshop, will be destroyed and the people freed from their subjection to a class. The matter affects both town and country worker, of every land, of every creed. The men of capital are stronger than the men-of-war and their strength can only be taken from them by the organisation of the working-class into a separate and distinct revolutionary Socialist party, such as The Socialist Party of Great Britain. J.K.

MAJOR ROPER W. CALDBECK, delivering an address before the Army League, said that every year 8,869 men were invalided, 7,162 deserted, 2,903 were discharged for misconduct, 1,563 were discharged as not likely to become efficient, and 21,943 were committed to Military Prisons (excluding India), and the Army Estimates for 1905-6 provided an extra sum of £95,000 for "additional prison accommodation." Verily, 'tis a great country.

CUTTINGS AND COMMENTS.

"Every man born on the soil of England had a right to claim work." Thus the Lord Bishop of Ripon. But who disputes the right to claim? Certainly not the Bishop's friends of the capitalist-class. Why indeed should they? The more men claiming the keener the competition and the lower the wages. Now if every man born on the soil of England put in a claim for the whole product of his toil and refused to allow the capitalist to non-suit the claim, there might, it is true, still be unemployment, but only because the worker would not require to work so hard nor so often. And as he would receive all the wealth he produced, there would be none left for my Lord Bishop, who would perforce have to work himself.

William Botting, aged 74, shot himself, having been forced to the conclusion that "Old men are like old dogs, and ought to be shot when they are past work." According to the dictum of American capitalism, when a man reaches the age of 40 he should be taken out and shot as useless for further profit-making. Here is a case in which the views of exploiter and exploited coincide. Ergo, there is no class war as Keir Hardie would say!

Referring to certain Trade Union amendments which he had heard were to be moved to the Government "Unemployed" Bill—that unqualified absurdity in which the S.D.F. have claimed their influence is apparent—the writer of the labour column in the *Echo* says: "It seems to be quite certain that Mr. Balfour will consent to none of these amendments, and, what is more, a Liberal Government would not assent to them either." As the attitude of both Liberal and Tory Governments towards labour is the same, the *Echo* writer has doubtless spoken truly, although in speaking truly he is not following the precedent set by other Liberal scribes whose business it is to induce Trade Unionists to lend their support to Liberalism, on the ground that Liberalism is infinitely better than Toryism. If he gives the game away so inartistically, the *Echo* writer we fear, will not for long remain unacquainted with the order of the sack.

Mr. William Crooks, M.P., L.C.C., has been talking again, this time to a *World* interviewer. "There is no snobbish or social distinction when once you get inside the House of Commons," he says; only "wonderful and splendid kindness" for Labour members apparently. He did not add "so long as they do as their capitalist fellow members want them to do,"—the addendum necessary to make the statement entirely true.

Mr. Crooks also has a remedy for the overpopulation of cities and the misery resulting from unemployment. He unbundled himself off to the *World* man thus:

"It is to be found on the land, the mother of us all. You go through England and see what vast stretches of beautiful and uncultivated soil there are. Why don't some of these wealthy landowners say: 'Hang it all, I will give up some acres or so to these poor underfed devils, shove up some tin houses and train them in agriculture'? They are no good at first. They hardly know the difference between a brick and a lump of clay. But they can learn, and they can quickly pick up their strength, and turn into good farm labourers, worth their 2s. 6d. a day in England and their 6s. 6d. a day in Canada. The experiment has been tried on a small scale and has proved successful. But we leave it to the hobby of an American philanthropist, and our own wealthy classes won't lend a hand."

This "remedy," though couched in unpolished and homely phraseology, hath an ancient and fishlike smell. We seem to have heard of the "shove 'em back on the land" cure, as Mr. Crooks would say, before. It is much the same as the reafforestation (or firewood manufacture) cure favoured by other "Labour Leaders," and

pre-supposes capitalist production without a large army of unemployed. Which, as the youngest of economic fledglings would be able to show, is ridiculous. Mr. Crooks should read more and talk less.

"A Rose by any other name—"

"A woman applied to Mr. Rose at the Tower Bridge Police Court for a pair of boots for her young daughter from the funds of the poor box. In refusing the application, Mr. Rose said he was averse to giving boots in the summer because he did not consider them as a necessity. Children could go to school without boots, especially this weather, or with canvas shoes, which could be bought for a shilling, or slippers."

Mr. Rose is no doubt a most worthy person, and has spoken according to his lights. If his lights are not very bright or his sympathy with working-class want not over strong, the fault is not his. The brutality of his indifference simply reflects the training he has received, the atmosphere he has moved in from his youth up. It is a not unusual expression of the callous cult of capitalism.

Mr. Rose is not to blame, but his reply to the woman asking for boots is strongly reminiscent of the reply of Foulon, of unsavory memory, of whom it is recorded that, in the days which preceded the French Revolution, he replied to the people who cried aloud for bread that they should eat grass. Foulon was the product of his time and was not to blame. But his latter end found Foulon hanging from a lamp-post with his mouth stuffed full of his grass.

Philosophic dissertations upon individual responsibility—or lack of it—have no great weight with the ill-educated striking against oppressive conditions. They personify the causes of their misery, and the persons selected are generally those who have been most brutally indifferent to the unhappiness of their position, or who have in some other manner been associated with the maintenance of the system spelling oppression: at these they strike.

We do not pretend to view this method of striking with favour. We are in existence as a political party in order to educate the working-class so that they may strike effectively at the ballot box without having recourse to the lamp-post. The lamp-post has had its day. But the representative of capitalism who speaks as Mr. Rose has spoken, is none the less in a dangerous position, because he emphasizes the existence of the gulf which yawns between his class and the oppressed and poverty-stricken working-class, and so helps to prepare the material out of which the Socialist Party will fashion the weapon that shall presently sweep capitalism out of existence altogether—the weapon of a class-conscious, well organised, working class. Mr. Rose is therefore in the dangerous position of contributing to the destruction of the form of society upon which his position depends.

A.J.M.G.

We commend to the chastened reflection of Mr. Gribble and the members of the S.D.F. in Northampton the fact that the gentleman who was largely responsible for preventing the case of the Raunds strikers coming before the House of Commons was precisely that gentleman whose democratic sympathies they expressed their appreciation of by assisting into Parliament. It was Mr. Labouchere's inordinate and intentionally prolonged remarks on the Women's Suffrage Bill, which he was frankly concerned to talk out, that robbed those who professed to be anxious to bring the matter forward of the opportunity to do so. Of course it might have been done in a disorderly way by breaking down a few of the forms of the House, but the "Labour" members are far too respectable to do that. Besides, it might jeopardize the esteem in which they are so proud to be held by their fellow members of the capitalist-class!

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION.

THE "New Method" is evolutionist. The "New Method" is reformist. The "New Method" stands above all for legality. In order to fully understand it in all its beauty, in all its power, we must first study its conceptions of evolution, reform, and legal revolution. Let us proceed in this order and commence with evolution.

The partisans of the "New Method", quite honestly, without doubt, put certain stupidities into the mouths of revolutionists, which naturally appear to them quite in order. The revolutionists, they say, believe that the social revolution will be the result of a coup, a struggle with the police, or, better, to employ the favourite expression of (is it necessary to name the minister?) "the stroke of a magic wand." The revolutionists are travestied as social magicians, or miracle-workers. And the realists of state Socialism—in theory very idealist—never miss an occasion of showing their sovereign contempt for these dreamers of impossible catastrophes. They alone are in complete agreement with modern science, founded on the principle of evolution. The revolutionists are romancists, Utopians. Has not Bernstein himself said that Marx even was but a common Blanquist?

What is the truth? Let us first point out that all the great masters of contemporary Socialism, those very men who introduced into it the idea of evolution, and who have in some manner saturated the spirits of men with their ideas, Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Ferdinand Lassalle, Peter Lavroff, were throughout their entire lives convinced revolutionists. It is an incontrovertible fact, and we will prove it.

The social work of Marx has been compared with that of Darwin in the domain of Nature. In fact, his classic work, the "Manifesto," which alone perhaps, of all books of our time, contains in a small space (some thirty pages) so many great and fertile ideas, develops quite a system of evolution in capitalist society. In the "Manifesto" we see Socialism burst forth, as the very consequence of things, from the very entrails of capitalist society. It is capitalism itself which fashions its own "grave-digger," the proletariat organised as a class party.

The "Manifesto" concludes with the ultra-revolutionary declaration which follows:

"The communists consider it beneath them to cloak their ideas and designs. They declare openly that their end cannot be realised but by the violent destruction of the existing social order. Let the ruling classes tremble before a communist revolution. The workers have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to gain."

Here we are very far from the theory "take care to make fear" ("Ayons peur de faire peur") which has conducted its author to the ministry of commerce. Yet, Marx put to flight all the miracle-workers, all the manufacturers of little projects put forward as so many panaceas guaranteed to save society from the misery of capitalism. It is true that he had not foreseen the project for the participation of socialists in the central power of the bourgeois state, which renders the revolution altogether unnecessary, and, above all, dangerous. A revolutionary party which does not inspire its adversaries with fear is ripe for government. But, it will never "conquer the world."

The idealist, Peter Lavroff, was in complete agreement with Marx, the materialist, on the question of violent revolution. Throughout all his glorious life he preached the Revolution in the name of reason, "justice and humanity." He sought to establish scientifically that "every Socialist who thinks logically must be a revolutionist." And he always added that the Revolution cannot be brought about without violence. Peter Lavroff introduced scientific philosophy into Russia, thus contributing more than anyone else to the overthrow of metaphysical and theological ideas in his country. He was the sworn enemy of miracles, and understood the miracle of social transformation by the word *participation*.

The partisans of legality are often pleased to

*Millerand.

quote a *Preface* of Engels where he traces a magnificent picture of the growth of the Socialist Party during the legal period. But the rascals forget to add that Engels himself protested against this publication, declaring that his ideas had been falsified through the omission of a conclusion containing an affirmation thoroughly revolutionary.

The statement of Marx is likewise invoked, that in England the Revolution could be achieved pacifically and legally. In his preface to the English translation of "Capital," Engels, on including the words of his great friend, wrote: "But he never omitted to mention that he doubted very much if the ruling classes in England would ever accede to a pacific and legal revolution." (Capital, Introduction, 1887). Otherwise stated: the revolution will be superfluous if the dominant classes are in humour for committing suicide. It is perfectly evident that Marx, who thoroughly understood the economic condition of England, wished to say nothing more than that all the material and technical conditions were at hand. In order to accomplish the Revolution nothing was wanted but the revolutionary lever. "Force is the midwife of every new society." The pains and violence of birth cannot be overlooked on the grounds that the embryo should be allowed to develop in an easy and regular manner. One might as well overlook volcanic eruptions on considering that modern geology has abandoned the catastrophic theory of the formation of the earth. The new-born will develop pacifically, "legally," but he comes into being *revolutionary*. The subterranean forces accumulate slowly, invisibly, but once arrived at a certain degree of intensity, they explode. "Revolutions in history are as necessary as tempests in nature," writes Malon, whom our good evolutionists do not qualify as "sectary." In truth, this class of "tempest" does not agree with ministerial combinations. But, since when do the phenomena of nature and history rest on the decrees of ministers, being "out of control"?

In 1887 at the Congress of Saint-Gall, Bebel, who of course is nothing but a romantic dreamer, declared:

"He who says that the final end of Socialism will be realised in a pacific manner does not know the final end, or, mocks us."

Further. It is only during its scientific period that, based on the principle of evolution, Socialism became revolutionary. The great Utopians, Fourier, Owen, Saint-Simon were pacific in their methods. They preached the social transformation to make the "revolution" needless.

It was exactly at the time that the social reformers addressed the monarchs, assembled at Aix-la-Chapelle, soliciting their "Collaboration" in social reform in the name of "social conservation." That was also the good old time when the noble dreamer Fourier used to look out daily for his "millionaire," pacific redeemer of suffering humanity.

The triumph of the truly realistic spirit was at the same time that of the revolutionary spirit. None but empiric minds who see no farther than the tips of their noses or who have some interest in cloaking historic truth, believe that revolution is contrary to evolution of which it is, in reality, only the fatal and irresistible outcome. Thus, the Utopian period of Socialism was pacific. The scientific period adopts revolutionary tactics.

Ferdinand Lassalle, who was the promoter of universal suffrage in Germany, a man of immediate action and pacific *par excellence*, recognised the revolution as a means of achieving any serious reform. He pointed out that many great reforms were brought about only by revolution. For him, as well as for every modern Socialist, revolution is but a moment, a period of crisis in the "normal" evolution of society, an *evolution which comes to a head*.

The abyss which our ministerialists seek to find between evolution and revolution under its sudden and violent form exists but in their imagination. But there exists an insuperable abyss between revolution and ministerialism.

Translated from the French of CHARLES RAPIPORT by F.J.T.

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

OVERHEARD.

Frank—(To Jack, who appears to be thinking furiously.) What is the matter now?

Jack—You fellows say we are wage slaves, and are cheaper to the masters than chattel slaves, but that's rot.

Frank—Steady, old chap; why is it rot?

Jack—Because the chattel slave had to work absolutely for nothing, while the masters must pay us wages.

Frank (laughing)—Well, even according to official figures the average wage of the modern worker barely represents his cost of maintenance, and as the slave was always fed and lodged, he could hardly have got less, could he?

Jack—Well—er—of course. Anyway the wage-worker is not a slave.

Frank—Oh? The essence of slavery is compulsion; the means employed are unimportant. Now is it not slavery to be compelled to toil for another?

Jack—Certainly.

Frank—Well, is not the modern worker absolutely compelled by fear of starvation to sell himself to a master? Can the workers get a living at all to-day without the permission of the owners of the mines, factories, railways, land, etc.? And are they not, therefore, the slaves of this owning class?

Jack—H'm! But still the wage slave, as you call him, is very much better off than the chattel slave. Just compare them.

Frank—Well, in the first place the chattel slave had a considerable exchange-value, and was sought after; whereas thousands of modern workers are compelled to tramp the streets in search of a master, and are starving for a crust. Jack looks glum.

Frank—In the second place a master will take more care of a thing that will cost him a big sum to replace, than of a thing that can be replaced for the asking.

Jack nods assent.

Frank—So that if a chattel slave falls ill the master will get him well quickly, for he cannot work or be sold when ill; but if a wage slave is ill he is turned out and left to starve, for another can be had for nothing.

Jack—That's right enough. If you feel unwell and get to work late two or three times, on the street you soon go.

Frank—Further it would hardly pay the chattel slave owner to overwork his slaves, for he would use them up too soon and have to pay heavily for new ones. But a modern employer finds it to his interest to use up his wage slaves as quickly as possible, for there are always plenty more to be had for the asking.

Jack—Yes, just as the modern contractor takes very great care that his horses are not overworked, but continually overworks his men.

Frank—That is so. The up-to-date capitalist uses his men only for the best years of their lives, and throws them on the scrap heap when he has taken the steel out of them.

Jack—Right again. They are turning out all the old men now. Only young men need apply. And at the pace they drive one can't last long at the game. But with regard to the chattel slave; he used to get flogged; we don't.

Frank—No, Jack, it is not necessary to flog us in order to make us work hard. The threat of the "sack," the fear of starvation, is quite sufficient. Between being flogged to death and slowly starved to death, the choice would be embarrassing, would it not? A large proportion of the working population of to-day suffer slow starvation *even while in work*.

Jack—I begin to see that we are the wage slaves of the owners of the means of life.

Frank—Yes. Private ownership of the means of life gives private power to absorb all the surplus produced. Slavery can only end by the democratic control of wealth by and for the wealth producers—that is Socialism.

Jack—Good! Speed the abolition of wage slavery!

Frank—You see, then, that wage-slavery, which hides its ugly features under the mask of Freedom, is much more profitable to the master-class than chattel slavery. And let me whisper this: Had it been otherwise, chattel slavery would not have been abolished.

FRED. C. W.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

To facilitate the transaction of the business of the Editorial and Management Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to conduct its official Organ, members of the Party and other readers are particularly requested to address all literary communications to the Editorial Committee, 34, Wilmington Sq., London, W.C., and all business correspondence, including Subscriptions and Advertisements, to A. Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.

Terms of Subscriptions.

	s.	d.
Twelve Months	...	0 1 6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	...	0 2 0
Quarter Column do.	...	0 5 6
Half Column do.	...	0 10 0
One Column do.	...	1 0 0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1905.

THE RAUNDS AND LEICESTER MARCHES.

The striking bootmakers of Raunds have marched into London and have marched out again, and, thanks to the fine weather experienced, the astuteness of the Liberal Party politicians en route (who tried, with considerable success, to make party hay while the sun shone) and the fact that the capitalist press had no other sensation to write up at the moment, they seem to have had a moderately good time.

Encouraged by their example, 500 unemployed workers set out from Leicester on a similar pilgrimage. But their time was not so happily chosen, and their numbers were unwieldy. So that they were reduced to sleeping on straw after marching in rain.

That the action of both parties enlisted a good deal of public sympathy at the moment is clear. But public sympathy butters few parsnips, and already the historic marches are among the faint memories of those districts that were covered, while outside of them they have faded from most recollections.

THE CONDITIONS OF SUCCESSFUL DEMONSTRATION.

What good purpose, from the point of view of the working-class, was served, cannot be clearly seen. Had the men set out in the full knowledge that the capitalists of London had interests in no way differing from the capitalists of Raunds or Leicester; had they commenced with no delusions on the score of the reception they would get at the hands of the representatives of the master-class in the House of Commons and Buckingham and Lambeth Palaces; had they understood that their position was the inevitable result of the private ownership of the means of life; and had their march therefore been frankly a demonstration of class-conscious workers in revolt with the object of stirring their class to revolt also, good work would have been accomplished. But to set out ignorant of their class position, and under the impression that if they were very peaceful and law-abiding and abstemious, and sang their grace before meals with becoming reverence, the capitalist-class would help them, as they appear to have done, was a folly that will bear fruit of disappointment and despondency for themselves; while by accepting the interested and much advertised hospitality of their enemies of the Liberal Party, the Raunds men have contributed materially to the confusion of their class, whose discriminating powers may not unnaturally be unequal to the task of grappling with the problem of why the Liberal Party, who helped the workers of Raunds, are

not the friends, but the enemies of the workers of Raunds.

POSSIBILITIES OF CONFUSION.

How far the Raunds leader, Mr. Gribble, of the S.D.F. (whose action, by the way, the S.D.F. made many pathetic attempts to exploit for their own party purposes with equally pathetic results), understood the dangers of the movement to the working-class whose interests he ostensibly serves, we do not pretend to know. Having undertaken the task of organising the march he had, of course, to find lodgment and food for the men, but if he had the knowledge that is claimed to be in the possession of all members of the S.D.F., he must have known in the first place that the appeal to capitalism in London would be as profitless as the appeal to capitalism in Raunds had been, and he must have seen in the second place how inevitably the class struggle would be obscured by apparent fraternisation with the representatives of the capitalist-class in the Liberal Party.

The Leicester leader, Mr. Sherriff, of the I.L.P. (whose action, by the way, the I.L.P. also made pathetic attempts to exploit for their own party purposes), seems to have endeavoured to make his contingent's march a demonstration in support of the Government's "Unemployed" Bill, which Mr. Burns says, and for once says rightly, is not worth crossing the street for, let alone tramping a hundred miles to support. And Mr. Sherriff should have known that under present conditions any "Unemployed" Bill must be a capitalist dodge to rid themselves of responsibility while endeavouring to convey the idea that they accepted it and were prepared to bear the burden of it.

THE POSITION OF THE S.P.G.B.

We are far from desirous of creating the impression that we are out of sympathy with class manifestations of the working-class. The Socialist Party of Great Britain is a working-class party, and is therefore concerned to do everything possible to arouse the class it represents from indifference into organised action against the present form of industrial organisation to which can be traced the evils under which the workers suffer to-day. But we well know that no working-class manifestation can be effective, no successful conflict with capitalism can be entered into except it be based upon a clear understanding of the class position. Upon this basis alone can be built the fighting organisations, political and industrial, of the working-class which by concentrating upon the conquest of political power and the substitution of the common ownership and control of the means of life for the present private ownership thereof, shall achieve the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the Socialist Republic. And it is because we know, what apparently the Raunds and Leicester men did not know, that nothing short of Socialism can materially affect the condition of the workers, and because we know that all attempts to secure a betterment in working-class conditions that do not take cognisance, and are not made in the full knowledge of this fact, are foredoomed to failure, and must tend to retard rather than to expedite the realization of Socialism, that we deprecate the actions of the persons responsible for the Raunds and Leicester marches.

A.J.M.G.

Major Roper Calbeck declares that the average soldier's pension is 8s. 2d. per week, whilst that of the officers is £4 per week! But of course, Capital and Labour are brothers, and the interests of the working-class soldier and the exploiting-class officer are identical.

Back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be had through any Branch Secretary.

PARTY NOTES.

The Manifesto of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to the Working-Class has been published in pamphlet form, and can be had from the Party Literature Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W., price 1d. post free. This pronouncement will, of course, be differently viewed by both the friends and the enemies of the working-class. The publication of the document marks the advent of a new era in working-class politics in Britain.

The Manifesto deals with the present position of the working-class, the historical developments which brought about that position, lays down the basis of working-class political action, and by a clear and sober analysis shows wherein the various political organisations other than the S.P.G.B. claiming to be the party of the workers fail to meet the requirements of the present juncture. No student of modern politics should be without a copy of the Manifesto.

What is the difference between the S.P.G.B. and the S.D.F.?—the Fabian Society?—the I.L.P.?—the L.R.C.? Read the Manifesto, which is replete with facts bearing on the differences. What are the tactics of The Socialist Party? Read the Manifesto.

The Party Organ and the Manifesto should be pushed at all propaganda meetings. During the summer we have the best opportunities of selling the Party literature. Make hay while the sun shines.

Propaganda meetings should always be held precisely at the advertised time. This is generally done, but a few cases have come under my observation where, owing to meetings being opened a little late, our speakers have failed to secure audiences they otherwise would have had. Let punctuality be the order of the day.

Branches and speakers are reminded that they should regularly send to the centre reports of the propaganda meetings, so that the entire propaganda activity of the Party may be accurately ascertained. If a meeting is worth holding it is worth reporting.

The West Ham comrades show evidences of great activity and the East Ham Branch of the Party is in process of formation. More power to their elbows!

The Romford Division Branch is opening an S.P.G.B. Club at 43, York Road, Ilford, and all Party members residing outside the Romford Parliamentary Division are honorary members. This Branch, too, seems determined to give a good account of itself, and has extended its activity into the East End of London.

In Islington the S.P.G.B. is at present well in evidence. In Finsbury Park our local Branch appears to have killed the efforts of the other organisations claiming to be Socialist, for during the past few Sundays our comrades have had no opposition "Socialist" meetings.

In other directions our Branches are doing well, and if the results so far are a fair indication as to the success of our Party during the remainder of the propaganda season, then we may rest assured that our efforts will not have been in vain.

The Delegate Meeting of the S.P.G.B. will be held at the Communist Club, London, on Monday, 31st July, 1905, 8 p.m., and in order that the E.C. may be enabled to present a complete report Branches are requested to send in their quarterly statements with the least possible delay.

Photographs of First Annual Conference of the S.P.G.B. are still obtainable, price 2/- Orders, accompanied by remittances, should be sent to the undersigned.

C. LEHANE.

THE TRUTH ABOUT CAMBORNE.

Much interest was manifested last month concerning the electoral activities of the Social Democratic Federation, when it was publicly asserted, on oath, that the candidature of Mr. Jack Jones, S.D.F., for the Mining Division of Cornwall, was being financed by "Tory gold."

The allegation was made at a public meeting held at the Public Hall, Camborne, on Saturday, June 3rd, when Mr. James Lightwood read documents, which he and his wife had sworn to. The following are the essential extracts:

"I, James Lightwood, solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:—

"For several years past I was superintendent of a number of model dwellings situate in Seaward Street, East Finsbury, which Mr. Richards, K.C., represents in Parliament as a Conservative. I became very friendly with Mr. Richards, and on more than one occasion have I discussed with him and his friends the political aspect of the Housing question.

"I had an interview with Mr. Richards some days prior to the 23rd of January, 1904, at my house. He told me he had a friend who was coming up from Redruth. He said 'He is a fine fellow, you will like him very much.' As he was going he said to my wife, 'Mrs. Lightwood, how would you like to see your husband an M.P.?' She replied 'He is happier as he is.'

"On the 23rd of January, 1904, I received from Mr. Richards a postcard in the following words:—

"Dear Mr. Lightwood,—I shall call on you on Saturday between 5 and 6.15 with a friend from Redruth, and if you are free I hope you will wait in for me or write when you will be free Saturday or Monday after 6.

H. C. RICHARDS."

"On the evening of the same day I received the postcard, Mr. Richards called as appointed. He brought with him a gentleman whom he then introduced to me as the gentleman from Redruth. This gentleman was Mr. Cheux, the Unionist Agent for the Mining Division of Cornwall. On this introduction Mr. Richards left, as he said he had to be off to the House. Mr. Cheux said that he had been deputed by a wealthy gentleman in Cornwall, who was a great sympathiser with the Socialist movement, to find a man who would stand as a candidate for the Mining Division. He said he wanted me to be the candidate, as Mr. Richards had spoken very highly of my qualifications. I declined to consider the matter. He pressed me as he said I was a Cornishman, a native of the Mining Division, and that I had worked in the mines as a boy (all of which was true). I told him that even if my qualifications were sufficient, I could not go down into the constituency without a local mandate. I suggested his applying to the Labour party for a man, but he demurred. I then suggested his applying to the Social Democratic Federation.

"On Thursday, January 28th, 1904, Mr. Lee, Secretary of the Social Democratic Federation, called on me. I knew Mr. Lee slightly. Mr. Lee said a gentleman from Redruth had asked him (Lee) to meet him at my house, and that they were anxious for me to become the candidate, and that a rich friend of the Redruth gentleman would find the money. Mr. Cheux did not, however, turn up while Mr. Lee was with me, but a few minutes after Mr. Lee had gone he called. He apologised for being late and hurried off to catch Mr. Lee at the office of the Social Democratic Federation. On Feb. 5th, 1904, I received a letter from Mr. H. W. Lee; this letter was written on the ordinary note paper of the Social Democratic Federation, and was in words as follows:—

"Mr. J. Lightwood,

4, Bartholomew Buildings, E.C.

Dear Comrade,

Shortly after I reached the office after seeing you last Thursday the gentleman came up. From what he said he seemed inclined towards you yourself running for the Camborne Division. Have you seen him since, and has he said anything more to you about your coming forward? Because if you thought of doing anything in that direction, we should be perfectly willing, I am sure, to leave it at that.

To-day another gentleman has been up. He says he comes from the one who saw me last Thursday. I gave him the decision of the Committee, which

was to the effect that before we could actually decide that someone from the S.D.F. should go down to Camborne, and prepare the way, so to speak; that is to say, it would not be the best tactics, to put a candidate down upon the Division unless some preparations had been made beforehand. To this proposal he readily agreed, and stated that he had been authorised to place something of the same suggestion before us. He says he will come in and see me again before next Tuesday, when the matter again comes forward for consideration.

I thought I would let you know how the matter stands at present, and I think I will call and see you on Saturday morning at about 11, if that will be convenient for you.

Yours fraternally,

H. W. LEE."

"A few days after the receipt of this letter Mr. Lee again called, accompanied by Mr. Green, the Treasurer of the Social Democratic Federation, and Mr. Cheux, and a fourth gentleman. They were with me over an hour; my wife gave them tea. They all urged me to accept the position of Socialist candidate, and Mr. Lee explained that my candidature would be endorsed by the Social Democratic Federation, and Mr. Cheux urged that his Socialist friend would pay the Federation all the expenses incurred, and that the Federation would remunerate me for my trouble. I persisted in my refusal, although they continued to urge me for a long time, but when they found I was obstinate they left, and I understood the Social Democratic Federation would find another person to undertake the job.

"I have in my possession a number of letters in addition to those to which I have referred in this my Declaration. Some from Mr. Richards, some from Mr. Lee, some from Mr. Cheux, and some from Mr. Hamilton. As these letters relate to a matter at present the subject of litigation, I am informed I should not be justified in setting them out here.

JAMES LIGHTWOOD.

"Declared this 29th day of May, 1905. Before me,

"F. E. B. CRAWLEY,

"A Commissioner for Oaths."

The Executive of the S.D.F. have issued an official pronouncement, and state that:—

"It is not true that the secretary of the Social Democratic Federation, Mr. H. W. Lee, approached Mr. Lightwood about the running of a Socialist candidate at Camborne. It was Mr. Lightwood who first called at the offices of the Social Democratic Federation. It is not true that our secretary arranged to meet the 'gentleman from Redruth' at Mr. Lightwood's office. It was Mr. Lightwood who arranged the meeting, stating the time when our secretary was to call. Mr. H. W. Lee consented to call, after consulting the Organisation Committee, who agreed that he should go with a 'watching brief' and report afterwards. It is not true that when Mr. J. F. Green, our treasurer, and the secretary called subsequently at Mr. Lightwood's office they found Mr. Cheux there. Mr. Cheux, they assure us, is absolutely unknown to them, and his name has never been mentioned in connection with any proposed Socialist candidature in the Mining Division. It is not true that at the interview in question Mr. Lightwood was pressed to become the candidate, or that the Social Democratic Federation offered to pay his expenses.

"Mr. Lightwood, when in London, though not a member we believe of the Independent Labour Party, and certainly not of the Social Democratic Federation, was, nevertheless, known to members of both bodies in Clerkenwell and Finsbury as a sympathiser with the Socialist movement. We were the more disposed, therefore, to consider a proposal of the character mentioned coming from him than we might have been from an entire stranger. Moreover, we were anxious to take advantage of any bonafide offer, as for some years past members of the Social Democratic Federation who knew the Mining Division have declared that it could be won in time by a Social Democratic candidate. The Social Democratic Federation would do nothing in the way of putting forward a Socialist candidate at Camborne until propaganda work had been carried on and literature distributed in order to make our principles known among the people, and until enquiries conducted by the secretary and treasurer convinced them that the offer to assist financially in running a Socialist candidate in Camborne came from a sym-

pathetic private, and not a political party source.

"The one important point on which the whole of Mr. Lightwood's statement centres is that the offer to assist financially the expenses of a Socialist candidate in the Mining Division came from, or was prompted by Mr. Reginald Cheux, acting as the election agent for Mr. Strauss, the Unionist candidate. That, if true, would undoubtedly suggest that the Unionist candidate believed that the presence of a Socialist candidate would be to his political advantage for which he was willing to pay. The Social Democratic Federation has always been willing to accept help from any quarter so long as no conditions are attached and no restrictions placed upon our speeches, and actions, providing always that the help comes from a private and sympathetic source, but not from a political party, centrally or locally, with a view to using Socialist work, organisation and influence for its own particular ends. We have been, and are still, convinced that the help for the Socialist candidature in the Mining Division is from a private and sympathetic source, and we see no reason, until Mr. Cheux's connection with that assistance is established, to alter our opinion."

Mr. R. F. Cheux has sent a communication to the Press in which he refers to Mr. Lightwood's story as "preposterous" and "manifestly absurd" but makes no denial of the statements excepting the following:—

"At present I need do no more than refer the public to the categorical denials of the officers of the Social Democratic Federation which have appeared in the columns of to-day's Press, and to state that at the time of the select 'tea party' which Mr. Lightwood says took place at his house, and at which I was alleged to be present, I was as a matter of fact in Cornwall."

The name of Mr. A. E. Fletcher having been mentioned in connection with the matter, that gentleman made the following statement to a representative of *Reynold's Newspaper*:—

"My position is this. I was asked by the secretary of the S.D.F. if I would go down to Camborne as the Labour candidate, as they considered I was the one man who was acceptable to the miners of this division. A friend of the Socialist movement, who wished his name not to be mentioned, was prepared to pay the whole of the cost if a Labour candidate, acceptable to the miners, was adopted. He also said that the present Liberal candidate was a member of the Rosebery faction, who had offered to retire if a Labour candidate were adopted. I said, if these conditions were carried out, I would go and address a meeting, and that I had no ambition to go into Parliament, but my ambition was to further the Socialist cause; but if I were accepted as a Labour candidate I would stand. But I was not aware that Mr. Dunn's promise to retire if a suitable Labour candidate was found was made two years ago, and I went down to Camborne. They listened to me, but the meeting was packed with Mr. Dunn's men. They heckled me, and asked if Mr. Dunn's promise was to be considered perpetual. I replied no, it could not be forever; but he was a jingo and a member of the Rosebery faction, supported the Boer War, and so on. But his chief supporter said, 'If you had been first in the field we should have adopted you.' Finding I had been misinformed as to Mr. Dunn's promise, and not being satisfied where the money was coming from, I retired. I am convinced that Mr. Lee, the secretary of the S.D.F., believed that the money was coming from a sympathetic source, and had no idea that it was to be supplied by the Tory party. In fact, he told me it was not coming from any political source."

Mr. Lightwood's promised further revelations will be awaited with interest, and in the meantime let us ask:—

(1) Why Mr. and Mrs. Lightwood should render themselves liable to a criminal prosecution for perjury if they have sworn to lies?

(2) Whether Mr. H. W. Lee's statement can be believed in view of the fact that at the Annual Conference of the S.D.F. at Shoreditch in 1903, he admitted that he had lied to the delegates at the previous Conference, and declared his intention of doing so again if he considered it necessary in the interests of the S.D.F. Is the present an occasion when it is necessary to lie "in the interests of the S.D.F."?

It will be noticed:—

(1) That although the S.D.F. now declare that they knew Mr. Lightwood only "as a sympathiser with the Socialist movement," Mr. H. W. Lee wrote him the remarkable letter which Mr. Lightwood received on Feb. 5th, 1904. If that incriminating document is a forgery why has not the S.D.F. instituted proceedings against the forger?

(2) That although these negotiations with the mysterious unnamed gentlemen took place in Jan. and Feb., 1904, the members of the S.D.F., assembled in Annual Conferences at Easter, 1904 and Easter 1905, were told nothing of the circumstances. If the Executive of the S.D.F. cannot trust their own members, how can the members trust the Executive?

(3) That although the S.D.F. deny that they know Mr. Cheux, they do not give the names of either of the gentlemen who interviewed them, and who were admittedly acting only as agents;

(4) That the S.D.F. declare their willingness to accept help from any quarter, so long as no conditions are attached. But here there were conditions, viz., that the money should be used, not as the S.D.F. Executive thought best, but in making a three-cornered contest in a particular constituency,

(5) That, with the exception of the last paragraph, Mr. Cheux's letter is an evasion. Mr. Lightwood has sworn that he holds letters from Mr. Cheux;

(6) That the S.D.F. misled Mr. A. E. Fletcher concerning Mr. Dunn's promise;

(7) That although the S.D.F. were convinced that the money came from a sympathetic private source, they could not satisfy Mr. Fletcher, who visited the constituency, on that point;

(8) That the S.D.F. statement, which appeared in *Justice*, was preceded by an intimation that "another statement will be at once sent out to the branches." In what respect will this differ from the public statement?

WEST HAM.

I am happy to be able to report on behalf of the comrades of the West Ham Branch, considerable progress during the month. Comrades will be glad to hear that, as the result of our activities (together with the valuable assistance of the Romford Division boys—who are so modest that they would never be heard of if I didn't mention them) in the adjoining district of East Ham, an East Ham Branch of the Party is in process of formation, and will probably be going strong by the time these lines come before the eyes of the expectant multitudes of Britain. London (and Watford) contains somewhere about a sixth of the population of this land of the free, and it is of the utmost importance that London be captured. The West Ham comrades have set their minds on establishing two other branches before the propaganda season is through. Where are the Branch Reporters? Branch Reports are the antidote to dry-rot. A.E.J.

By *Politics* we mean the business of *Government*, that is to say, the control and management of people living together in a *Society*. A *Society*, again, is a group or mass of people, bound together by a certain common *principle* or *object*. A mere chance crowd is not a *Society*; it has no definite object, it collects and disperses at the whim of the moment, its members recognise no duties towards one another. It has no history, no organisation. Professor JENKS.

The Board of Trade state that in May 271 Trade Unions, with an aggregate membership of 575,512 reported 29,487, or 5.1 per cent. unemployed, as compared with 5.6 in April and 6.3 in May 1904.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

TO ALL PARTY CORRESPONDENTS.

Branch Secretaries, members and others sending communications to the Central Office are requested to address them to C. Lehané, General Secretary, and to indicate such letters as are intended to be dealt with by the Executive Committee by writing the words "Executive Committee" on the left hand top corner of the correspondence.

C. LEHANÉ, General Secretary.

ETHICS AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

AMONG the middle-class "Socialists" who run the so-called labour movement in this country, it is hardly fashionable just now to deny the reality of the class struggle; yet when it is shown how necessary it is to base working-class political action on that reality, these

UTOPIANS WIGGLE LIKE EELS

to escape such a logical conclusion. When driven by argument from their objections on practical grounds to the class war basis, such sentimentalists often fall back on the assertion that it is immoral, that it stirs up strife and sets one class against another.

Now, with those who profess to base their "Socialism" on the New Testament, such a position is not to be wondered at; for to them the injunction applies, to "Resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also. And if any man sue thee at law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain."—*Matt. V.* Obviously, the only logical attitude for such people is that of absolute non-resistance to the capitalists. And there the working-class may leave them.

As is only to be expected, the capitalist and his satellites strongly deprecate any hostile attitude on the part of the worker. The proper conduct of the working-class should be, according to capitalist ethics, duly sheep-like. According to this code,

WORKING MEN SHOULD BE THRIFTY

(that they may work cheaply and keep off the rates), they should be industrious (that they may pile up wealth for others), and above all, they should be meek and obedient (that they may duly obey the laws kindly made for them by their masters). The prevailing code of ethics has its foundation in the material interests of the ruling class, and may be summed up in the words, "Whatever injures capitalist interests is immoral." The charge that the class struggle is immoral is founded on such a code. For us, then, it is necessary to look at the matter from a higher standpoint, that we may see whether an insistence on the class struggle is immoral or not in the light of *humanity's* interests.

What is the basis of

THE MODERN CLASS ANTAGONISM?

It is based on the fact that one section of society owes its income and its superior position to property, to the ownership of the means of producing wealth; whilst another section, so vast as to be practically the nation, owes its inferior position to the fact that it owns no property but is compelled to live by the sale of its labour-power to those who own the means of life. Out of the total product of labour the worker cannot obtain, in general, more than his cost of subsistence. Those who own the instruments of labour appropriate the rest. Thus there is born a class struggle, pursued consistently by the capitalists, but, as yet, ineffectively and spasmodically by the workers. The scientific Socialist urges a more consistent waging of this struggle because (to put it shortly) only by the defeat of the enemy can peace be obtained.

All classes will, as in the past, fight bitterly to retain their superior position to the workers'. The only class that can be relied on for the abolition of privilege and power to exploit, is

THE UNPRIVILEGED PROPERTYLESS WORKING-CLASS.

The recognition of the class struggle is consequently the only effective basis of working-class action, for it is childish indeed to expect that the capitalists will of their own accord get off the backs of the workers. Obviously, the immediate interests of all except the working-class are opposed to the abolition of private property in the means of life.

The strife of to-day is, then, not created by the Socialist, but is

THE RESULT OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

maintained by the ruling class. The Socialist seeks to enlighten his fellows on the causes of this struggle, and to show how utterly futile it is to expect the owning class to abolish the cause of strife, or abandon in any way its own interests. He wishes to point out above all, that since the interests of all sections of the capital-

ist-class are fundamentally opposed to the interests of the workers, therefore the same policy of the working-class must be in consistent opposition to all capitalist political factions however these may name themselves. The struggle is already going on. The Socialist endeavours to give it definite and consistent aim, that the conflict may be more speedily ended.

Those who would, on moral grounds, have the workers refuse to recognise the class struggle should, to be logical, refuse to

STRUGGLE AGAINST PARASITES

of any other kind. For in society the class which lives by the ownership of the means of life of the workers is a parasitic class, sucking to itself by its monopoly the fruits of the industry of the people. Not, indeed, that one need hate the individual capitalist, for he is the product of his circumstances; but in the interests of toiling humanity the firmest action must be taken. The power to exploit must be wrested from the parasites. They will, of course, oppose this by cunning and by force and will have to be fought, for non-resistance is the policy of the weak-minded.

Clearly then, the cause of the present struggle (i.e., the private ownership of the machinery of wealth production and distribution), can only be abolished by waging war on the class which defends and maintains private ownership. And since the only class that, by its material interests, is unfettered to the maintenance of private property is the proletariat, on this class must fall the toil and

THE BATTLE FOR FREEDOM.

Thus the only means of ridding mankind of conditions which now bind the mass in degradation and slavery, is the active opposition of the workers to the parasitic class as a whole; and what is this but the prosecution of the class war?

The victory of the Socialist working-class is the only possible ending of this great struggle. This, however, does not mean the subjection of the capitalist-class by the workers; it means the abolition of capitalism and an end of classes, for the great unprivileged masses cannot secure equality of opportunity without abolishing class privilege, and privilege is based on private property. The triumph of the great working majority thus involves the emancipation of all from class oppression, for the interests of the toiling masses are fundamentally

THE INTERESTS OF HUMANITY.

The workers are now the only necessary class in society, and upon them all tasks are devolving. To the capitalist remains the task of tearing the coupons from his shares, and reaping the reward of his abstinence—from labour.

The democratic ownership of the means of wealth production must necessarily abolish the economic basis of classes and of class antagonisms, and unite all in a bond of labour with identical interests. Under such conditions it must be unnecessary and above all unprofitable for the vast majority to exploit a few. Hence society will have but one aim, to lighten the toil and increase the well-being of all by the greatest possible economy of labour and life. In the society of

HARMONISED MATERIAL INTERESTS

that must result from the abolition of class parasitism, the greatest well-being of the individual will only be possible by promoting the well-being of all. Thus will the welfare of all become, for the first time, the immediate interest of each.

Socialism is, then, the ethics of humanity, the necessary economic foundation of a rational code of morality. The interests of the human race are bound up with the aspirations of the oppressed working-class in its struggle with capitalist domination. As it has very truly been said: "Militant, the workers' cause is identified with class; triumphant, with humanity."

F.C.W.

In an office in Fetter Lane, London, a machine is now being exhibited by the inventor, Mr. George Livingston Richards, which does the work of hundreds of men. In the course of an hour it folds up thousands of magazines, puts them in gummed wrappers, addresses each one to the person for whom it is intended, and sorts them out into sacks, according to the locality to which they have to be sent.

THE WAR AND ITS EFFECTS.

THE War in the East will have far-reaching effects upon the Socialist movement in Europe and in America. As Socialists we are neither enthusiastic Pro-Japs or Anti-Russians. We know that whichever wins it is but a win for capitalism. Although we anticipate the ultimate triumph of Japan we do not for one moment believe that this will benefit the Japanese workers, far from it. The only result for them will be a greater intensity of labour necessary for the support of the Japanese capitalists, who, after the few years which will be required for the adjustment of industry, will enter into the hurricane development that modern capitalism with its machinery and trusts needs.

Japan of to-day is one of the great competitors for the trade in the East. Japan of a few years hence will be the great power. Her close communication with the advanced form of capitalism already in existence in the United States is bound to have the effect of putting her in the front rank of capitalist development, while her relationship with China may well result in her becoming the most important factor in the industrial revolution of that unhappy bone of contention among nations, or the capitalist portion thereof. Japanese officers have already been engaged to drill and organise certain Chinese regiments and as their brains have been used by the Chinese because of their superiority in military affairs, so will they be utilised to organise Chinese industry. The training of centuries in the manipulation of tools enables the Chinese to adapt themselves to the requirements of modern industry in a remarkable way and the "white Australia" policy of the Australian Labour Party, the Anti-Asiatic legislation, if we may so term it, of other countries directed against yellow immigration, bears eloquent witness to the readiness with which the Chinese enter into effective competition with white labour—always, of course, to the detriment of the latter seeing that the standard of comfort of the "Yellows" is so much lower than that of the "Whites," and seeing that the competition of cheap labour always fosters a tendency for wages to be reduced to that level.

The fact that white workers will have to face is that capitalism is international, and that it is not "Whites" and "Yellows" that meet in the markets of the world, but buyers and sellers, whose nationality does not matter one iota as far as the value of the goods to be exchanged is concerned. Thus though the capitalist class may be induced to legislate against the Yellow races in the White countries, they assuredly will not legislate against the buying or selling of the products of Yellow labour, when these products are made in the Yellow man's country.

The effect of the War from the East alone, will make a considerable difference to the United States and Canada almost at once. This is certain to show itself in the greater intensification of labour, and the concentration of capital in those two countries. The corresponding effect of these to the workers will be a still larger army of the unemployed and a considerable decrease in the proportion of the total product received by the working-class as wages.

This in brief will be the result of the recuperation of Japan, and the subsequent opening-up of China by her, with all its vast resources of wealth and its unlimited supply of labour. But how shall we fare in Europe?

One thing is certain and that is the overthrow of the Russian Autocracy. Whether this will be accomplished by the disintegration of the West and South-West into a number of independent States at once, or by the adoption of a constitutional government for the Russian Empire as it is, with a later devolution, time will show. But whatever happens it means the more intensive and extensive development of capitalism proper in Russia. To-day, American, English, French, and German firms have their factories there. In spite of the patriotic howl raised by these people about supporting home industries, etc., there is not one of them but who is perfectly willing to establish his factories in "despotic Russia" if he can get cheaper labour or raw material, even if it does mean that a few of his fellow-countrymen have to put up with the mere trifle of being starved in the meantime.

The West of Russia with its large towns of St. Petersburg, Riga, and Vilna, and the South-West with Odessa, Kiev, and Kishenev, and the South with Baku and the other oil towns are being rapidly brought under the full domination of capitalism. True, the old regime holds sway over the agricultural parts, but with the breakdown of the autocracy and the establishment of a constitutional government capitalism would be supreme in the towns and this would have an immediate reaction on the agricultural life of the surrounding districts.

The increased competition in the markets of Europe would react at once on the whole of the European working-class to its detriment. The effect of the increased competition in both hemispheres would be bound to make itself felt to the workers in both. The results of such development will make the workers more and more conscious of the fact that their interests do not lie in the perpetuation of the capitalist system, but in its overthrow. There will be greater opportunities for the Socialist to point out the only remedy—Socialism. The intensified class feeling that will be created, will be moulded into definite concrete form by the Socialists, by the building up of a revolutionary Socialist Party for the overthrow of the capitalist system and the establishment of the Socialist Republic.

E. J. B. ALLEN.

BOOKS AND BOOKLETS.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

[By MR. GEORGE BARNES, Secretary to the Amalgamated Society of Engineers.]

In view of the fact that the average age of the working-class at death is about 30 years, the possibility of attaining to the opulence represented in the sum of 5s. per week 35 years after they have on the average shuffled off this mortal coil, would not, at the first glance, appear to be a matter of vital concern to ordinary wage slaves. Closer examination, however, shows that through some incomprehensible oversight of a beneficent capitalist providence, a considerable number of workers do manage to escape death in mine, factory, or workshop, or by starvation and other "natural causes," and arrive at the stage of the sere and yellow with vitality sufficient to pump a thin stream of thinner blood through the channels that 65 years of hard living have not entirely clogged or shrivelled, and to maintain that flicker of energy necessary to hold the various portions of their bodies in something approaching their original form.

The precise number who achieve this great age is very uncertain, but Mr. Barnes feels justified in putting it down in round figures as one million. For these he proposes, with that "mystic insight" into, and "fine judgment" of, the requirements of the aged worker which his biographer (in the same pamphlet) so highly applauds as elements most needed in a labour aspirant to a decrepit legislature, that the State should provide a pension of 5s. per week. As the cost of the keep of a pauper in a workhouse averages 9s. to 10s. per week in the country, and much more than that in London, it will be seen that the proposal does not err on the side of extravagance.

How the worker is expected to live upon such a munificent stipend, at an age when he is unable to wrestle with the scrag-of-mutton diet of his more vigorous days, Mr. Barnes does not explain. That they cannot live upon it he, parenthetically, appears to recognise. That they cannot augment the sum by thrift during their earlier years, for the very sufficient reason that any margin that they may have had in the course of their history was invariably on the wrong side—he admits. Then how are they to live, except indeed, in the way that Mr. Barnes appears to suggest, viz., by their children (if they have any) taking their pensioned parents in and catering for them at cheap rates—a fatuous suggestion, surely, in view of the general inability of the children to keep themselves.

Indeed and indeed, these "Labour leaders" in travail give birth to some of the most petty-fogging and inconsequential schemes that mind of man ever conceived. And to get his old age starvation allowance Mr. Barnes, says will necessitate the thorough organisation of labour

upon a political basis. By that means alone he holds, can the essential steam be got up behind the demand. The folly of it! To get the working-class to concentrate upon a measure that not one in thirty will ever live to be affected by in the hope that those who do may secure a reward of 5s. a week upon which to starve! "As through a glass darkly" Mr. Barnes seems to see that only by fighting can the working-class achieve anything at all. Does he not understand that this implies that the capitalist-class will concede nothing except through fear? Does he not see, therefore, that the concession will be in proportion to the demand? Then why does he endeavour to fritter away the energies of the working-class upon a tuppenny-a-penny old age pension scheme, when the workers can be just as easily organised upon the basis of their class interests and their energies directed to the demand for the full results of their labour? Educate the workers to a knowledge of their position and the reasons for it; to a recognition of the complete and irreconcilable opposition of interest existing between them and the capitalist-class, and to the extent that they grow in class-consciousness, to the extent that their forces are welded into an intelligent whole, to the extent to which they thereby develop into a formidable menace to capitalist interests, to that extent will the fear of the capitalist grow, to that extent will old age pensions and similar sops be offered by affrighted capitalism in an endeavour to stay working-class progress towards the Co-operative Commonwealth. As it is, Mr. Barnes is simply playing the capitalists' game by keeping the working-class mind occupied with non-essentials.

A. J. M. GRAY.

ILLUMINATIONS.

[By THE FLASHLIGHT MAN.]

JOHN BURNS has been the chief supporter of Mr. J. Allen Baker, L.C.C., the Liberal candidate at the East Finsbury election.

Upon the L.C.C. Mr. Baker is a "Progressive," the descriptive name by which the Liberals try to hide their identity in municipal matters. It is the old tale of the wolf in sheep's clothing.

At Mr. Baker's first public meeting the great J.B. said the candidate he was there to support had one great claim upon them, and it was enough—he was against the Government.

Whether a government of the capitalist faction of which Burns and Baker are such shining lights would be less capitalist than the present Burns did not state.

His reason for backing Baker is no better and no worse than the S.D.F. reason for backing Burns, Philip Stanhope, Lionel Holland and other capitalist candidates at the last general election—they were against the war.

Not the war which is being waged all over the world between the capitalist-class and the working-class, but the struggle for political supremacy between the dominant factions in South Africa.

It is true that, previous to urging the workers to vote for Burns, the S.D.F. had denounced him as "a self-seeker and a traitor to the cause of the people"; had declared that he was "firmly caught in the nets of the Liberal party"; that he covered his "recreancy and treachery with ambiguous and lying allegations of cowardice and knavery against those whom he had deserted"; that they urged the workers of Battersea to shew their self-respect by treating him as the workers of New South Wales did Fitzgerald, Kelly and others—"kick out the traitors"—that they issued a cartoon depicting "Judas Burns betraying the Christ of Labour" to the Liberal Party, led by Asquith; and declared that "such a creature should be hounded from out of the company of all decent folk."

And after all this, my friends, they urged the workers of Battersea to vote for Burns, the

Battersea S.D.F. supported him, and Councillor Jack Jones of West Ham canvassed for him!

One would think that the surest way to inspire confidence in the minds of the thinking working-class is to prove to them that you are reliable, that you mean what you say, that you are logical and consistent. But the S.D.F. thinks otherwise.

Philip Stanhope, for example, whom the S.D.F. supported at Burnley, H. M. Hyndman standing down, has been described by the S.D.F. as a "third-rate Liberal hack." Most people understand this to mean a political prostitute. Did the S.D.F. mean this of Stanhope? and if they did why did they withdraw Hyndman and urge the workers of Burnley to vote for such a person?

Of course we know that statements have been made in Burnley and elsewhere concerning an alleged contribution to the funds of the S.D.F. which Stanhope made about the time of that election. But does anyone imagine that the political policy of the S.D.F. would be affected by contributions from outside sources to its funds?

"Any Socialist who would compromise with capitalism, provided he can exact from the enemy some pennyworths of reform, is earning the scorn, not the gratitude, of his children's children, who, like himself, will be born into slavery if no more heroic effort be made to break the chains of capitalism and wretchedness. We do not want any opportunists in the S.D.F. We point out to them that there are organisations formed for the express purpose of getting pennyworths, and if not pennyworths then 'ha'porths' of Socialism, and we humbly give them leave to depart a body which calls upon its members to make unceasing, untiring efforts to prepare itself for the final struggle in the class war, which will not be a sham fight, followed by a march-past of Labour M.P.'s shouldering Blue Books, and the S.D.F. programme of palliatives embodied in Acts of Parliament."

The above is an extract from a leading article in *Justice*. Of course, it is not of recent date. It is more than twelve years old, and was written by J. Hunter Watts.

It is an illumination showing the difference between then and now, between what the S.D.F. was and what it is. And when we think of what it might have been we are sad.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT—Exchange List. "La Vanguardia" (Argentine). "The Social Democratic Herald" (Milwaukee). "The Labour Record." "La Internacional Revista Socialista" (Argentine).
Owing to great pressure on our space several important articles and communications are crowded out of the present issue.

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 1.

MANIFESTO

OF
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF
GREAT BRITAIN,

Containing, in full detail, a statement of the
Principles, Policy, & Rules
OF THE PARTY.

PRICE: ONE PENNY.

Post free, 1 copy, 1d.; 6 copies, 5d.; 12 copies, 9d. Special terms for larger quantities. Orders and remittances should be forwarded to the Literature Agent of the S.P.G.B.—
F. C. WATTS, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W.

Printed by Jacomb Bros., 2a, Wingfield Road, Stratford, E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published by C. Lehané, Gen. Secretary, 107, Charlotte St., W.

Socialist Party of Great Britain.

OPEN-AIR MEETINGS.

SUNDAY MORNINGS, 11.30.

BATTERSEA, Prince's Head.
FINSBURY PARK.
ILFORD, Roden Street, Ilford Lane.
PADDINGTON, outside Prince of Wales.
REGENT'S PARK.
TOTTENHAM, West Green.
WOOD GREEN, Jolly Butcher's Hill.

SUNDAY AFTERNOONS, 3.30.

VICTORIA PARK.

SUNDAY EVENINGS, 7.0.

EDMONTON, Angel Road.
FULHAM, Effic Rd.
ILFORD, Seven Kings Station.
PECKHAM RYE.
TOOTING, Broadway.
WANSTEAD PARK STATION. (7.45)
WATFORD, Market Place.

MONDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

ILFORD, Roden Street.

WEDNESDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

BATTERSEA, Falcon Grove.
TOOTING, Broadway.

FRIDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

BATTERSEA, Prince's Head.
KENSAL RISE, Quadrant.
WATFORD, Market Place.

SATURDAY EVENINGS, 8.0.

EAST HAM, opposite Ruskin Arms.

These meetings will be addressed by the following:—

E. J. B. Allen; T. W. Allen, A. Anderson, H. Belsey, G. C. H. Carter, J. Crump, J. W. Day, J. Fitzgerald, W. Gifford, P. C. Herbert, T. A. Jackson, J. H. Kennett, R. Kenny, J. Kent, G. T. King, C. Lehané, F. S. Leigh, F. G. Thompson, F. C. Watts.

The International Socialist Bureau desires to call attention to the following publications relative to the International Congresses which can be obtained at the Maison du Peuple, Brussels, and at all the best booksellers:

The International Socialist Congresses:
Agendas, lists of delegates, resolutions, Paris, 1889; Brussels, 1891; Zurich, 1893; London, 1896; Paris, 1900 0.75

The International Socialist Congress of Amsterdam, 1904. Agenda and texts of resolutions, offered in three languages 0.25

Reports and resolutions submitted on the questions in the Agenda of the International Socialist Congress, Amsterdam, 1904 1.00

Resolutions in three languages on the questions submitted in the Agenda of the International Socialist Congress, Amsterdam, 1904 0.50

The Socialist and Working-Class Organisation in Europe, America, and Asia with a supplement. The volume, of more than 500 pages, contains the reports of the various Socialist Parties of the whole world on the political and trade-unionist movement from the Paris Congress of 1900 to the Amsterdam Congress of 1904 3.75

The number of copies of these publications on hand being very limited, it is particularly requested that all those who desire to obtain copies should do so at the earliest possible moment.

All orders must be accompanied by remittances made out in the name of Camille Huysmans.

The offices of the Bureau have been transferred to the Maison du Peuple, Brussels, and in order to avoid any delay all correspondence (letters, reviews, newspapers, etc.) should be forwarded to the following address: "The International Socialist Bureau, Maison du Peuple, rue Joseph Stevens, Brussels."

Branch Secretaries and others
SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

CENTRAL OFFICE:

COMMUNIST CLUB,
107, CHARLOTTE ST., LONDON, W.
General Secretary - C. LEHANE.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Business transacted every Saturday at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W. Membership in the Central Branch can be obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—Kate Hawkins, sec., 47, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 8 p.m. at 34, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST LONDON (Central).—G. Fletcher, Sec., 305, Wilmott Street, Bethnal Green, E. Branch meets every Friday at the Secretary's address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 34, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 49, Mablethorpe Rd., Fulham Cross, S.W. Branch meets alternate Mondays at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Thursday at 8 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—Padraig Ua Toibin, Secretary, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets every Tuesday at 8.30 p.m. at the Co-operative Stores, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Oak Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—J. Kent, Secretary, 5, Rutland Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at S.P.G.B. Club, 48, York Road, Ilford.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.

WATFORD.—G. T. King Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays in month, Economic Class 2nd and 4th Sunday, at 3 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Park Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at Spiritualist Hall, 32, Dames Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Branches and members should purchase their literature through the Party Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W. Write for particulars as to terms, etc.

CAPITAL.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION.

By KARL MARX.

(Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free 5s. 6d.

From F. C. WATTS, as above.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES.

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LABOUR.

By PROF. J. E. THOROLD ROGERS.

(New Edition, Revised, Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free 5s. 6d.

From F. C. WATTS, as above.

POVERTY.

A STUDY OF TOWN LIFE.

By B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.

(Illustrated by Folding Maps, Diagrams, &c.)

(Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free 4s. 6d.

From F. C. WATTS, as above.



THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 12. VOL. I.]

LONDON, AUGUST, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Readers who can endorse the foregoing in its entirety are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the nearest Branch or with the General Secretary. See Directory, page 8.

THE CURSE OF NATIONAL PRESTIGE.

The dawn of peace appears in the Far East.

Slav and Mongol have faced each other on many a battlefield on land and sea, and victory has been uniformly with the new world power of Japan. This war was essentially a commercial war, as all wars are to-day carried on in the interests of commerce. All international relations, diplomatic and military, are becoming more and more commercial in their nature.

Some years ago the late Lord Salisbury declared that all wars in the future would be railway wars, and later he avowed that they would be tariff wars. He saw clearly as we Socialists see that war is but a manifestation of the antagonism of interests existing in the several national spheres of industry. We have only to look at

RECENT WARS

in which European powers have been engaged to see that they have all been economic.

Norway and Sweden may be seen in a state of extreme tension because the ruling class of Norway believe that Sweden has been securing preferential commercial treatment through the appointment of a Consulate whose sympathies and interests were purely Swedish. Because of this commercial friction the Norwegian Storting has passed a resolution deposing King Oscar and placing their country under the control of a provisional government.

Greece made war upon Turkey because she lusted after the rich olive groves of Crete. France and Germany were at war because France had ambitious thoughts of extending her boundaries to the Rhine while Germany was desirous of possessing the broad, smiling plains of Alsace and Lorraine. America fought with Spain for the possession of the plantations of Cuba and the Philippines. Britain crushed out the national independence of the Transvaal and Orange River Republics.

During the latter of those wars what was the FEAR OF THE RULING CLASS

as expressed in their Press? Not of the loss of life of the soldiers on the veldt, not of the thousands of children done to death by official incompetence, or something worse, in the concentration camps; not of the burning of homesteads and farmhouses in the Vaal; no, it was none of those things. The real fear was shown in the thrill of horror which was felt by the monied class in Park Lane or on 'Change when the rumour was current that Botha had blown up the Rand.

Nor is it a new thing for war to be fundamentally economic. In one stage of civilisation the food question causes tribe to fight against tribe, the fate of the defeated tribe being to serve as food for the victors. In another phase of civilisation the captured in battle are sent as helots to toil for the benefit of those who have vanquished them.

As Britain deliberately crushed out the trade and manufacture of Ireland and of India in the interests of her own manufacturers, so have countries sought for colonies and for extended territory in order to secure trade monopolies. In other directions

THE CLOVEN BOOF OF COMMERCE has displayed itself. Thus the union of the Parliaments of England and Scotland has ever

been defended on the plea that it gave to the latter all the commercial privileges that the former had won for herself.

Although our contention that war has always been fundamentally economic can be justified from every historical epoch, yet it would be going too far to say that this has always been obvious. Many wars have appeared on superficial examination to be primarily religious, while others have been excused on the ground of maintaining national prestige. When recently the Baltic Fleet shot down innocent fishermen on the Dogger, when France ignored Germany in her arrangements with Britain, Spain and Italy as to her position in Morocco, in the thousand and one other occasions on which war has been in the air it has been the maintenance of national prestige which has been the excuse and the justification put forward.

In the worship of this fetish Britain replied to Russia's seizure of Port Arthur by the seizure of Wei-hai-wei, and Germany by the fortification of Kiau-Chau. Britain having a sphere of interest, another phrase for

A SPHERE OF EXPLOITATION,

Germany must have a sphere of interest in the province of Shantung, while France and Japan seek for similar enforced "concessions."

The above remarks have been called forth by our witnessing dissension in the recently unified French Socialist party on the question as to whether the party should take part in wars carried on by the ruling powers of France. Among Socialists there appears some uncertainty as to the proper position to adopt with regard to this question, and a few remarks on the subject may not be out of place.

Beaconsfield, in his novel "Sybil," declared that England was divided into two nations. These two nations are the nation of propertied and the nation of propertyless. "The nation of the haves who do not work, and the nation of the have-nots who do. The question we have to determine for ourselves is, 'Is the country of the propertied worth fighting for by the nation of the propertyless?'"

I do not think it will be questioned by any Socialist that it is his duty to oppose the wars of the ruling class of one nation with the ruling class of another, and to refuse to participate in them. When Germany seeks to force war upon France so as to secure for herself special trade advantages with Morocco, it is for the millions of German and French Socialists to declare in no uncertain voice that they will have no part or lot in the war. If they do this then there will be little fear of war. The military power of Russia has failed in the Russo-Japanese war largely because of the unrest among the Russian people, and the military power of Germany would be equally powerless against

A REVOLT AGAINST WAR

amongst the most intelligent of the political parties in the Fatherland.

With defensive wars the question becomes somewhat complicated. Is the Britain of the ruling class worth defending by the workers? Has the worker to-day a wages-slave earning but a bare subsistence wage—anything to fight for?

As it is the country is being slowly conquered by the operations of the international capitalist. The British worker to-day is the employee of a limited liability company or of a trust whose shareholders are international, and it is the capitalist class who rule the political machine.

Were Germany to conquer France or France to conquer Britain, he would be ruled by no more alien class than that which rules him to-day. As the result of being a citizen of a country which is nationally independent his condition is such that he has no guarantee from week to week of his power of earning his livelihood. Thirteen millions of him are living in a state of semi-starvation, and the individuals composing those thirteen millions are always changing. In the slum districts the conditions are such that crime is at a premium, and virtuous living at a discount, so much so indeed that it is a constant surprise that the results of these conditions are so good.

The worker to-day has

NOTHING TO FIGHT FOR.

The interests of his masters are not his interests. National prestige is not his prestige, but is used to force from other nations commercial treaties and conditions which in the end prove adverse to him.

What the Socialist has to realise clearly is that the interests of his fellow workers in other lands are nearer to his than are those of his master in his own country. The bonds which bind worker with worker, irrespective of nationality, are those of class solidarity. The meeting of Japanese and Russian on the platform at the International Socialist Congress at Amsterdam in August last was but symbolical of this solidarity. From the capitalist-class of every country the worker is divided by a gulf of class antagonism which can be bridged only by the absorption of the capitalist-class in the working-class, the result of the coming Social Revolution.

When the capitalist-class fully realises that they can no longer depend upon the working-class, when they find that the worker has at last come to understand his class position, and that he has no reason for fighting in his master's interests against those with whom he has no personal quarrel, he, the capitalist, will see that it is impossible to appeal to national prestige, to patriotism, to the spirit of

"OUR IMPERIAL RACE"

and all the rest of the phrases used of old, and then it will be impossible to make war in so light a spirit, or to raise questions likely to create a tension between the ruling classes of different nations.

It is for the worker to see that his position demands that he should fight only for his class emancipation, and that nothing, internal reform or national strife, should draw him away from his determination to fight for the realisation of the Socialist regime.

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES UNITE! YOU HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE BUT YOUR CHAINS. YOU HAVE A WORLD TO WIN. R.E.

ENRICO FERRI on SOCIALIST TACTICS.

WHAT is the essence of the great and fertile innovation of the revolutionary method of Marx and Engels, as distinguished from Utopian, sentimental Socialism, and from Anarchism? It consists solely in the substitution of the genetic method, the investigation of causes, for the old empirical, symptomatic method, in harmony with the scientific doctrine of transformism or natural evolution.

In medical practice, as is well known, up to the middle of the nineteenth century, before the clinical methods of observation and experiment were tried, diseases were diagnosed and treated only by their symptoms, their outward manifestations. The discoveries of Pasteur, for example, and of his followers, of microbe germs that cause infectious diseases, led to the replacing of the symptomatic cures, which were powerless against such plagues as cholera and typhoid fever, by the elimination of the causes for the purpose of preventing disease. And surprising results were obtained in this way. It is infinitely better to build water-works for a city suffering from typhoid fever than to increase the number

of physicians for the treatment of the diseased, or to open public dispensaries and reduce the price of medicines.

In the treatment of the infectious disease of exploitation and misery, Marx and Engels have, therefore, said: It is useless to continue that empirical and symptomatic treatment, that more or less modern and rational charity, those social reforms for the so-called "amelioration of the condition of the working-class," and the like. It is necessary to eliminate the causes of poverty, and these are in the last instance found in the monopolization of the means of production and distribution as private property, that reaches its climax in that period of civilization which is characterised by bourgeois capitalism. Against this rising tide of economic slavery, human misery and injustice, little bourgeois reforms from "soup kitchens" to "charity balls," from laws on "female and child labour" to "boards of arbitration" or "Sunday rest," are as useless as the use of Anarchist violence, individual or collective, against this or that capitalist, this or that "economic tyrant," this or that "political tyrant" is senseless.

The work of the revolutionary method is much more tedious, tiresome, and complex. We must combat and eliminate the fundamental causes of poverty, instead of the more or less apparent symptoms. And as the elimination cannot be accomplished by one stroke of collective or individual violence, nor by social reform legislation, nor by a dictator's decree, we must form a clear and energetic proletarian mind and redeem it from ignorance and servility. Ideas travel in human boots, and proletarian evolution does not proceed spontaneously, nor does it descend from the providential heaven of government action. It rather takes shape partly through the natural agency of economic and social phenomena and partly through the pressure of the proletarian mind itself, which struggles by legal means for the realisation of its revolutionary aims.

These aims are called revolutionary and cannot be called otherwise. Not that they preach the building of barricades or personal assaults, but because they aim at the complete transformation of the fundaments of society, instead of limiting, weakening, and entangling themselves in reforms which leave the basis of private property untouched, and which the ruling classes have always granted, not for our benefit, but in their own interest, for the purpose of retarding the progress of the revolutionary idea.

ENRICO FERRI in "Il Socialismo."

A LOOK ROUND.

COUNCILLOR Hickmott is asking all who favour the establishment of an active Socialist organisation to write to him at St. John's, Sevenoaks.

Active Socialist work in any district is to be welcomed, when it is Socialist, but all who accept Mr. Hickmott's invitation should have a clear understanding with him before they start work. I do not know whether he is still a member of any organisation claiming to be Socialist, but I do know that he secured his seat on the Sevenoaks District Council as an "Independent" because "you cannot run as a Socialist down here, you know." I also know that he was the only advertised speaker at an open-air meeting of the Bromley South Liberal Association held on June 28th, and I am informed that this meeting was one of a series held in support of Mr. Maurice, the Liberal candidate. So I think a warning is necessary.

The S.P.G.B. is the only Socialist body in this country which does not support Liberal candidates. Socialists of Sevenoaks and other places please note.

In my June notes I referred to the "Tactics" question in America. Victor Berger, who supported a capitalist nominee at the Milwaukee Spring elections, has been removed from the National Executive of the American Socialist Party. Verily, the way of the transgressor is harder in the States than in this country!

The working-man is free to work when, where and for whom he likes, say our opponents. Is

he? Lord Claud Hamilton declared last month that in West Ham the Great Eastern Railway Company pay £30,000 a year in rates, and if the cost of establishing a town for 2,500 men were less, they would move them to some other part of the country. The capitalist-class consider the workers as so many goods and chattels, as they really are, to be shifted from place to place as it suits the employing class to shift them. And this is freedom!

Another point often urged by our critics is that the capitalist is entitled to a greater reward than the worker because of what he risks. But the working-class risk every day that which the mere "investor of capital," great or small, never jeopardises, and which, unlike that which the capitalist risks, "when once destroyed can never be supplied" - his life. Such disasters as the recent explosion in the Wattstown colliery illustrates the fact.

Throughout the United Kingdom about 25 miners lose their lives at work every week, whilst upon the railways last year, excluding passengers, 958 persons were killed and 4,220 injured, which average 18 and 81 per cent respectively. All other departments of industry claim their toll of the workers' lives. Each member of our class takes his life in his hands every time he enters the mine, factory or dock, and all for a few paltry shillings per week.

A correspondent of a London financial journal, writing from Kalgoolie under date June 17th, refers to the impending struggle between the Chamber of Mines and the workmen. He says that the prevailing impression is that an all-round reduction of wages will take place. So that, although "the representatives of capital and labour are marshalling their forces," it is a foregone conclusion that victory will lie with the former, as it must as long as capitalism lasts.

However, our friend has made a discovery. He concludes his report by saying, "At the same time living on the fields is fairly high, and you very rarely hear of anyone living on the gold-fields from choice." Does the scribe suggest that men are driven, say by the ever present fear of starvation, to leave England, home, and beauty in order to work and live on the goldfields?

The Agricultural Returns for 1904 have just been issued and show that the area under corn crops has decreased from 8,517,000 acres in 1902 to 8,258,000 in 1904. This fact should be noted in view of our article on "Invasion or Starvation" in last month's issue.

Eureka! A Mr. David Lubin has held a meeting in his rooms at Kensington Palace Mansions to fully explain a scheme "to kill corners"! It is the King of Italy's plan, but was suggested to him by Mr. Lubin. The agriculturist, they say, is practically at the mercy of such people as the "cotton kings" and "wheat kings" of the United States, and so they will establish an International Chamber of Agriculture which will aim at the world-wide circulation of reliable information, by which every grower, manufacturer, and consumer can know the exact state of the market.

And this, according to Mr. Lubin, will "stop the monkeyings" of these new Mephistopheles who call themselves "kings"; there are to be no more corners. I can imagine Leiter, Armour, Brown, Sully, and Co. trembling in their skins. Lubin, the new Jack-the-giant-killer, with the aid of a King-by-divine-right, who may be able to govern "his" people, but cannot prevent the real kings, thousands of miles away, from withholding their supplies of food and raw materials, has arisen, and by the aid of an information bureau, is going to lay them low. What do you say? That the information will enable them to operate more successfully and will place the people more in their power than ever? Perhaps so. But the real giant will one day awaken, will recognise that the only way to kill corners is to expropriate the possessors of the means of life, to assume the ownership and control, to organise production and distribution in the interests of the whole people.

J. KAY.

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

WOULD MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP BE ADVANTAGEOUS TO THE REALISATION OF SOCIALISM?

A BUNCH of letters lie before me. The popularity of my articles is obvious from their most casual perusal. One thing, however, requires some little protest. I am prepared to answer in due rotation any question affecting Socialism, but I am not an encyclopædia - yellow imperialist or otherwise - and I am not called upon to answer questions relating to the existence of beings of human shape and human intelligence in Mars; neither will I be permitted to offer suggestions anent the proper cultivation of the garden. My forte is not in either of these directions. Doubts and difficulties in the way of the acceptance of Socialist principles or in the way of their enunciation are welcome and will be dealt with.

From the batch before me I select one which bears the insistent blue pencil mark of the Editor of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD. And here I may say that any weakness that may at any time be found in any of my articles is the result of his handiwork. He is a gentle being - a sheep in wolf's clothing - but he has his own methods of securing attention to his behests. The letter is from "Ignoramicus," who writes:-

"Dear Economics, 'Doubts and Difficulties' are good business. They make the crooked path straight. Your column resembles the capitalist system in that it contains the germ of its own destruction. This is a dark saying. Being interpreted it is as if to say that some day it will destroy itself by banishing all doubts and removing all difficulties. But that day is not yet. Here is, for example, the question of the relation of municipalism to Socialism; the extent to which municipalism may be regarded as the John the Baptist of Socialism. John, you may remember, prepared the way of the Lord. Does municipalism do the same for Socialism? If not, why not? I suggest a few observations upon the limits of municipalism would be helpful. There are many doubts and considerable difficulties existent upon the subject. Please dispel the one and remove the other so that we may rejoice in the fullness of knowledge where to-day we ponder in perplexity."

And the Editor, his voice insistent as a curtain lecture, punctuates upon your letter, most ignorant one, "Economics not to exceed two columns!"

The Socialist claims for his Socialism that its advent as the basis of Society means *inter alia* the reorganisation of all industrial operations. The application of collective and combined effort to every sphere of industrial life with, at the same time, the elimination of all useless labour and the greatest economy of man's activity consistent with the satisfaction of the greatest measure of his needs, must follow upon the realisation of Socialism.

Of those industries some are essentially local, some national, and some international, and the mode of organisation will probably depend upon the actual conditions obtaining in the industry. The railways and the steamships of the Socialist regime will be organised upon an international basis, whilst the bakeries and local food supply will be, at first, municipal concerns. When the methods of transit are revolutionised by the electrification, mono-railification, etc., of the railways, and Manchester is two hours journey from London, these things will be altered.

So, too, we must leave out of consideration the suggested devolution of our large towns, and the transmission of force from various river and tidal centres to be applied locally. The powers of man in the future over the forces of nature are not only unknown, but inconceivable to us. And it is these powers which determine man's methods of satisfying his wants, and through his methods of satisfying his wants, the form of the society for the time being.

We have then to take the capitalist society in which we live and the immediate trend of events in the direction of Socialism. We have then to recognise that the evolution of society from capitalism to Socialism affects every part of society, and that any municipal progress must have its influence upon national progress. But it follows that any causes obstructing national development must tend to obstruct municipal or local development.

If we could dissociate the municipal from the national and collectivise all municipal concerns, we should have an entirely different set of circumstances to consider than we have existing in actuality. It might then be an interesting question whether such an extension of municipal enterprise would greatly benefit the working-class so long as the capitalist system obtained in factory, railroad, or mine. It is presumable that so long as the capitalist system obtained in those - the most staple industries in England - the wage of the worker would be determined by the average cost of his subsistence, and that his standard of subsistence would be kept at a very low level by the growing competition of his unemployed fellow workers.

In the condition of things which obtains to-day the problem is different. Here we have the fact that municipal enterprise is limited to considerable extent, and that the conditions favourable in other directions to its extension are conditions not favourable to its extension. In seeking for municipal control and ownership we find that it is not always the working-class who are most eager.

The people who stand to benefit most by municipalism are usually the ground landlord and the capitalists who find in the economy brought into the public and other services a means of reducing their taxation, or of securing more than compensation for their taxation in a cheapening of transit of their goods. The municipalisation of the tramways has hastened the tendency of centralising the factories and warehouses in the centres of the cities and the creating of suburbs at the termini, with increased value of the land upon which the suburb is built.

We see the landlords benefit not only in jerry-built suburbia, but in the creation of open spaces. Landlords have, indeed, been known to present the ground for a garden to the municipality to be laid out and maintained by the latter, while the house property facing this open space has gone up out of all proportion to the building value of the gift. We have every admiration for the business capacity of the capitalist who makes profit even from his philanthropy.

We find again that the Chambers of Commerce - the apotheosis of local capitalism - favour municipalism. The municipalising of the bakeries, or of the milk-shops, means a greater chance of pure bread and pure milk to those who are able to buy those commodities, and purer food means - the quantity remaining the same - increased efficiency. The worker becomes a more capable worker, a better wage-slave, a source of greater profit to the capitalist.

I am convinced then that the municipalisation of local services is desired more by capitalists and traders than it is by workers. That while perhaps ensuring purer food substances to the worker, it would not enhance his power of purchasing those substances, and would even do him harm, inasmuch as it made him a more efficient worker and enabled fewer of him to turn out the same quantity of commodities, thus accentuating the unemployed evil.

Its educational value, upon which certain municipalists lay stress, is no greater than the educational value of the trust or the limited liability company. In each of the latter the worker by his co-operation turns out commodities for the market under the management of men of his own class, and the municipal worker would do nothing more. Such municipalised industry is as essentially capitalist as is the privately owned monopoly.

At the same time while municipalism is of no material advantage to the working-class in improving their position, the Socialist must needs point out the necessity of wresting all industries from the power of the capitalist. He must show that everywhere free competition develops into monopoly as its logical conclusion, and that monopoly can only cease when the whole of the powers of production belong to the whole of the people.

The men to whom an appeal to municipalise is made are the same men to whom an appeal is to be made to socialise. Any attempt to dissociate the industries which are local from those which are national is an attempt to divorce two parts of a question which are, so far as Socialist propaganda is concerned, necessarily united. Such attempts are reactionary. So also are the parties or organisations which make them.

I trust that, so far as the space at my disposal would permit, I have made myself clear, and that the difficulties of my ignorant friend have flown. What is to be remembered is that Socialism must affect every phase of men's lives, and every phase of methods whereby they maintain themselves in life. It is the frittering away of their powers in the advocacy of reforms which it is to the interest of opponents of Socialism to grant that we must attribute the comparative weakness of the forces of Socialism in this country. W. T. Stead in this month's *Review of Reviews* complains of the scientist who displays more interest in the insects which infest the abdomen of a flea than in the vital interests which tell for the improvement of humanity. In the same way we have to complain of the men who, wishing to climb the four-foot wall which divides Socialism from Capitalism, commence by manufacturing a thirty-foot ladder.

The best way to economise your efforts and make your work for Socialism most effective is to join THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN and work uncompromisingly towards the goal of the conscious and unconscious efforts of humanity. All desiring fuller information as to our Party should apply to our General Secretary, and any of my readers who may join it may expect a hearty welcome from that humblest (I had almost written abject) of its members

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT.

The Editorial Committee of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD have pleasure in announcing that they have in course of translation, and will shortly publish, the famous

ERFURTER PROGRAMME,

BY KARL KAUTSKY.

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 1.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN,

Containing, in full detail, a statement of the

Principles, Policy, & Rules OF THE PARTY.

Reynolds says it is "amusing reading because of its terse and graphic description of other Socialist and Labour Parties."

PRICE: ONE PENNY.

Post free, 1 copy, 14d.; 6 copies 5d.; 12 copies, 9d. Special terms for larger quantities. Orders and remittances should be forwarded to the Literature Agent of the S.P.G.B., F. C. WATTS, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

To facilitate the transaction of the business of the Editorial and Management Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to conduct its official Organ, members of the Party and other readers are particularly requested to address all literary communications to the *Editorial Committee, 34, Wilmington Sq., London, W.C.*, and all business correspondence, including Subscriptions and Advertisements, to *A. Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.*

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months	£	s.	d.
	0	1	6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion	£	s.	d.
Quarter Column	0	5	6
Half Column	0	10	0
One Column	1	0	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.



SATURDAY, AUG. 5, 1905.

YEAR ONE OF "THE SOCIALIST STANDARD."

WITH this number we achieve the completion of our first volume and the first year of our existence. We have gone the round of the seasons, we have successfully negotiated the initial difficulties always attendant upon the issue of a new paper, and we have settled down to our work as the literary mouthpiece of The Socialist Party of Great Britain with any tremors on the score of our ability to keep on which a few of us may have started out with, at rest.

When we remember the number of journals appealing to a far greater constituency than we, unfortunately, can hope to affect for many a day, journals with a financial backing almost fabulous by contrast with our puny revenue, yet which have succumbed to the pressure of adverse circumstances probably not greater than those we have combatted, we are conscious of a not unpardonable feeling of satisfaction and elation at the results of our year's work—a satisfaction and elation that we have good reason for knowing is far from being shared by those who so confidently anticipated the early demise of the Party that came into existence as a protest against their defamation of the name of Socialism. We refer, of course, to those pseudo-Socialist organizations—particularly the Social-Democratic Federation—which, by compromise with capitalist parties and by pandering to working-class ignorance make such material contribution to working-class division and confusion. The advent of our little journal killed the hope they entertained of the speedy dissolution of the Party, and they will, we conjecture, regard the celebration of our first birthday with feelings that will not be improved by the knowledge that the Party's literary offspring is a sturdy, robust youngster who has already intervened in English working-class affairs with marked effect and whose voice has penetrated if not to the uttermost parts of the earth, at least to those parts where any Socialist movement exists and who has succeeded, therefore, in giving wide circulation to the strong, plain case The Socialist Party of Great Britain has made out in justification of the attitude it has adopted.

To-day, with confidence in the correctness of our position and enthusiasm for the great cause we champion, unabated, strong in the strength that comes of the knowledge of our stability and

perceptibly growing power, we send fraternal greetings to our comrades the world over and record anew our unwavering determination to prosecute relentless war against all the forces of capitalism in whatever guise they come; against working-class oppression, against obscurantism and sectionalism and all that makes for working-class delusion and impotency; to keep in the forefront of our advance the red flag under which the workers of all nations must marshal themselves if they would win to their freedom; to keep that flag unfurled and aloft and boldly emblazoned with the object of our mighty mission and to lower it never; to march by the undeviating road that leads direct to the goal of our desire, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left to curry favour with ignorance or to secure place and power at the cost of principle—to do, in brief, all that men may to educate and organize the working-class against the day when the germ of destruction inherent in the capitalist mode of production, shall have rotted the heart of capitalism itself and broken down the social superstructure erected upon it, to the end that they may the more readily and surely enter into their heritage.

THE DECAY OF SOCIALISM.

MR. KEIR HARDIE is reported as having said in the Berlin "Sozialistische Monats-Hefts" that "In England Socialism appears to be a decaying force. Even the working men can scarcely be said to believe in its doctrines." This may or may not represent the view Mr. Keir Hardie intended to convey, but it is easily conceivable that the man who would render lip homage to the "obsolete Marxian dogma" of the class struggle which he repudiates at home—in order to secure admission to the councils of the international working-class assembled in Conference, would also endeavour to represent that Socialism as a decaying force through the Continental Press which here in England he is interested to hail as the exact opposite. Mr. Hardie seems to be either a much misunderstood person, or a person playing a double game.

HEROISM OR IMBECILITY?

"To no section of the industrious working-class are we under deeper obligation than to the miners . . . The Kingdom and Empire of which it is the heart, owe much to Welsh coal. . . . No deed of valour on the battlefield can surpass the splendid but quiet and unostentatious bravery which these rough workers display . . ." Yes, according to the capitalist press the whole world stands agog at the heroism of the miner in times of catastrophe similar to the recent explosion which took such a fearful toll of working-class life in a Welsh mine. But let these same heroes take a stand in order to secure a few of the comforts of life to set off against the dreadful hazards that they daily face; let them organize to fight the capitalist class for some improvement in the unmitigated hardships of their condition; let them so much as hint a threat against the liberty of their masters to take the whole product of mine labour less that diminishing quantity necessary to the maintenance of the physical effectiveness of the miner, and this same Press will send such a howl of indignation up to high heaven at the unutterable selfishness that would reduce profits, and the crass stupidity whose insistent demands can only be satisfied at the risk of driving trade out of the country, that the workers in alarm cease their agitation or reduce their request by one half or (which amounts to the same thing) hasten to agree to the appointment of a concili-

ation Board, under the impression that they have done a wicked thing, or, with the idea generally fostered by their leaders, that they must do nothing to alienate public sympathy.

"Heroes" they are when they suffer suffocation without protest; endure hardships without complaint. "Bulwarks of the Empire" they, when they return to work without hesitation even while their comrades' mutilated bodies are being brought out of the bowels of the earth. But let them organize for some amelioration in what is ironically designated their "lot" and they are scum to be flouted or children to be wheedled or dogs to be shot as at Featherstone—shot ruthlessly, unhesitatingly, with the calculated approval of capitalist hacks misnamed Labour Leaders who, having mounted to position upon working-class backs, betray the trust and sell the interest confided to their keeping.

The line between working-class heroism and working-class imbecility is, in the eyes of capitalism, thin indeed. And seeing that, however small the demand, capitalist good opinion (the preservation of which to the unenlightened working-class mind is so important) is alienated; however feeble the protest capitalist love is turned into hate, capitalist bullets take the place of capitalist benevolence, it does seem to the casual observer that workers in the mine and factory stand to lose nothing by increasing their demand from the present absurdly ineffectual ha'penny or penny an hour advance in wages or the establishment of the *status quo ante* Farwell, to the demand for the full result of their labour and the abolition of an altogether useless and unnecessary capitalist class.

WHY PRAY?

"There is a lamentable increase in the number of those who are only casually employed and the difficulty is increasing every year for elderly and even middle-aged men to obtain work . . . God help the labouring man when he gets old."

THUS Mr. Thomas Holmes, one of the best known of police court missionaries. But for that matter God help the labouring man when he is young. And God help the labouring man's wife and the labouring man's children whether the labouring man be young or old. If God can help he may as well help all who require it, and if abject want justifies helpful intervention, then many a million of the working-class of any and all ages of this and other countries have qualified.

So we might pray if prayers could avail. But Mr. Holmes has been appealing to his God for 21 years. Before him countless multitudes raised their voices in supplicatory chorus to the same supposititious personage in the same nebulous region. "God help all poor folk" they cried, but God was deaf, or God was dumb, or God was impotent for no response came and has not to this day. So that the poor have tired of appealing and those only pray who desire a cheap salve for their souls and an easy road from a difficult position, or those who, sufficiently educated to be conscious of their helplessness, are not sufficiently educated to have severed themselves from beliefs of fetiches born in the childhood of the world.

We are concerned that all poor folk should know why they are poor so that they may apply the remedy for their poverty which collectively they have the power to do. And the first thing they will appreciate in the day when they understand is, that neither gods nor devils nor heavens nor hells can help them into their own; that upon themselves and themselves alone must they rely for any change they may desire in the poverty that environs them, that eats into their lives and against which they protest and sometimes actively rebel. They will understand then that prayers will not prevail against the robbery of which they are the victims; they will understand that they must work out their own salvation and achieve their own emancipation. Mr. Holmes must pray if he will. We know a more excellent way.

Palliatives and Practical Politics.

AN INDICTMENT OF REFORM.

We are in the throes of another great agitation. The popular pulse has been quickened, the popular mind has been stirred, the popular spirit has revolted against the latest flout of the popular will and the popular fiat has gone forth in a yell of popular execration—"Death to the House of Lords!" Wherefore all the forces of progress have formed up in fighting array; the progressive pulpit, the progressive press, the progressive politician, have all leaped to arms animated by one great popular principle, united in one great popular party, and have gone forth with "practical politics" inscribed on their banners to do battle with the pallid peers or, parenthetically, perish in the process. For the "Over the Bridges" Tramway Bill, fashioned by the mediocrity of Spring Gardens, after many exhibitions of practical statesmanship on the part of the L.C.C. M.P.s., has been incontinently kicked out of the House of Select Thieves after having passed

THE HOUSE OF COMMON THIEVES

by the casting vote of that moment of mediocrity, Mr. Speaker.

Hence these tears. Hence these wild and whirling words. Hence this display of frenzied determination on the part of professional politicians out of office, who, scenting the spoils from afar and calculating upon the short memories of the working-class, have rushed into the public places of the land in an endeavour to create a popular turmoil that will assist them into position.

How many of these great agitations for the same old and hoary object are contained in the memory that can compass the last 25 years? And how many times have the working-class risen like gudgeons to the bait, only to find their energies wasted and their interests sold in the result?

As though the House of Lords mattered. As though it were not an institution built up upon the same system of

WORKING-CLASS SPOILIATION

battered by working-class ignorance to which can be directly traced all the economic evils that working-class flesh is heir to; an institution that must go down with the system upon which it depends, before the pressure of an educated, well organised proletariat.

The House of Lords, the Monarchy, the State Church and the rest are all so many embellishments of the capitalist system, so much embroidery of the ugly basal fact. The destruction of such embroidery would not effect the working-class position in the smallest degree. The abolition of the House of Lords would not necessarily have effected the passing even of a trampy Tramway Bill. If the measure was one that materially affected capitalist interests, in the event of the non-existence of the House of Lords, it would never have passed the House of Commons. As it is the House of Lords plays the game of the capitalist members of the other House. The latter know that their titled confreres can be relied upon to

CONSERVE CAPITALIST INTERESTS,

and therefore under some circumstances they will indulge in something that savours of working-class legislation, and secure the kudos of enhanced political standing in the eyes of a purblind people. In other words they succeed in conveying the idea that they are friends of the working-class, and so strengthen their position at the hustings what time their non-elective fellows in the House of Lords look after the swag. And then with tongue in cheek they conduct abolition of the House of Lords agitations while the workers cheer them on.

Well, the workers will cheer until they understand. And until they understand, that cheer is all the cheer they will get. But presently they will appreciate the fact that they are poor and wretched because they are robbed, and they will know that the

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ROBBER CLASS

sit in the House of Lords and the House of Commons alike, and on both sides of both Houses.

There is no greater barrier to working-class emancipation therefore in the House of Lords than exists in the House of Commons. It makes no difference to the working-class whether their exploiter is the Lord Dudley or the plain Mr. Smith. Plain Mr. Aird was no less an exploiter than Sir John Aird now is. Consequently an educated and well organised proletariat would concentrate upon the central fact upon which all else depends, and the measure of their determination will be the measure of the concessions they will obtain. Subsidiary obstacles to working-class advance, such as the House of Peers is supposed to be, will be removed by the capitalist-class in the hope that the glamour that once magnified them into matters of importance in the eyes of the working-class will still be sufficiently strong to dazzle their understanding and induce the belief that the capitalists are prepared to make large sacrifices for the benefit of their poor brethren of the lower orders.

That is the position of THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, both in regard to

POLITICAL REFORM AND SOCIAL REFORM.

We hold, and can produce evidence *ad nauseum* to show, that to focus the working-class mind upon two or three or a dozen palliative proposals, simply plays the game and saves the face of the capitalist-class. Every palliative measure (when they are such) can be conceded to a working-class so concentrated, without endangering the central position. Because, except the workers are class-conscious, they will, and do, treat such concessions as evidences of the friendliness and concern of capitalism for labour. The class position is, for a time at any rate, abandoned. The class struggle is obscured. That is the lesson that the history of reform movements teaches. That is the reason, and the only justification for, the existence of parties claiming to be Socialist. Moreover, and this point merits all the emphasis that can be applied to it, many of these palliatives are directly advantageous to capitalist interests. In such cases the workers are at

THE DOUBLE DISADVANTAGE

of being seduced from their class position and being the more easily manipulated as instruments of profit production.

On the other hand, with the workers educated and organised on the basis of their class position and alive to the perennial, irreconcilable antagonism of interest existing between them and their exploiters, any palliative measure secured would mean the strengthening of their position and the facilitation of their advance.

To the objection that the working-class are not prepared to assimilate the whole Socialist philosophy and must be brought along on the milk of reform before they can be fed on the strong meats of revolution, the answer is that the comprehension of the simple facts of Socialism involves no great mental exertion. Indeed, the absorption would have been an exceedingly simple process for the normal person had not an army of half-leaf politicians and reformers with the baseless fear of the inability of the average mind to understand more than their

POTTERING AND PATHETIC LITTLE FUTILITIES

in their hearts, spread their wares like the pedlars they were, before the untutored gaze of the workers. Honestly or otherwise they manufactured a man of straw, a bogey, and having done so, called upon all good men concerned for the true advancement of the poor to scream with affright. And to this day honest and dishonest reformers and palliators have screamed and fled before the miserable straw-stuffed effigy they themselves created.

Small wonder therefore that the workers, fed for so long upon the diluted wash that answered for mental food with propagators of procrastination, should regard with suspicion the real and satisfying viands to persist with the 'food simile' the Socialist offers them.

Had it been otherwise, had the real causes of, and only remedy for, working-class poverty been preached clearly and consistently by those who knew the truth, we should have

A FAR DIFFERENT TALE

to tell to-day. Our tale would have been of a rapidly growing and solidly welded working-class party such as few if any countries could excel.

I repeat that the normal mind, cleared of the

confusion that the dissemination of futilities has largely caused, can easily understand the simple proposition that the poverty and misery within their daily experience, is due to the fact that the wealth they create is not theirs; that it is not theirs because the land and machinery by the aid of which they have been enabled to produce and distribute wealth, are in the private possession of a comparatively few people; that the non-possession of these means of life (by and through which alone they can produce the things necessary to their existence) reduces them to the necessity of selling the only thing they have their power to work to those who do possess the means of life; that therefore they are themselves

NOTHING BUT COMMODITIES

(because they cannot dissociate themselves from the labour power which they sell) and are bought and sold as other commodities are bought and sold; that just as the price of other articles is determined by the supply of and the demand for those articles, so is the price of labour power determined; that just as competition causes the price of other articles to revolve about the cost of their manufacture, so does competition cause the price of labour power to revolve about the cost of its manufacture (which is, of course, the cost of the keep of the worker and his family); that therefore the existence of the unemployed is necessary to capitalist interests because while the market is flooded with labour, competition for work will keep the price of that labour (wages) low, and because if labour was scarce its price would rise, to the detriment of course, of profits; that therefore the capitalists, whatever their professions, will never do ought to materially affect the unemployed problem. And finally and because of all this,

THE ONLY REMEDY

for working-class poverty and the unhappiness arising from it is the destruction of the system of the private ownership in the means of life upon which the whole evil rests, and the substitution of common ownership and control, that is ownership and control by the whole people, of those means.

This, we claim, is simple enough for the way-faring man, though a fool, when his mind has been cleared of the stumbling blocks assiduously created by the agents of the capitalist-class, acting in that capacity unconsciously or deliberately. Among these agents we include of necessity

REFORMERS AND HALF-LOAFERS

and all others who by act or word contribute to working-class confusion because they, in so doing, are buttressing the capitalist system which depends upon working-class ignorance.

And that is briefly the explanation of the clause in our Declaration of Principles (at which so many cavil) which says that we are in opposition to all other political parties, whether avowed capitalist or alleged labour, because all as we shew—as we have shown—(see the Manifesto of THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, just published) contribute in act or word or both to working-class confusion.

Therefore are we opposed to farcical anti-House-of-Lords agitations and the like.

WE PREACH THE CLASS WAR.

We show that the capitalist as such can never have interests in harmony with the worker as such. We hold up Socialism as the only hope of the workers. We urge the futility of palliatives (except to the class-conscious worker) while the central fact remains unaffected. We refuse to be scared by the wretched bogey which reformers have created. We are out to keep the issues clear as a pike. We preach Socialism—WE, THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

ALEC J. M. GRAY.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

H.W.P. (Birmingham).—The words used by Lansbury at the 1896 Conference were, "Any few men and women can run an organisation if plenty of money is found, but it requires a principle and a real steadfast belief in principle to make a man or woman sacrifice both time and money for a movement which, in the main, is for the benefit of those who will inherit the future." But that was before the S.D.F. admitted pro-monarchical aristocrats to membership, and devoted its energies to the establishment of "bub-a-nub" boot clubs.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondents must be brief. Communications must be authenticated by name and address of writer and written on one side of the paper only. The writers ONLY are responsible for the views expressed.

A USEFUL LETTER.

The following letter, typical of the confusion that unfortunately exists, we the more gladly publish in full since it provides the post whereon to nail a common misapprehension of our position.

Larkfield, Chilbolton,
Stockbridge, Hants.

9/7/05.

Sirs,

Having read your party organ for months past I beg to state that except as a purely propagandist body I can see no reason for the existence of your party or for believing in its successful growth. Parliamentary action may as well be dropped by you, as I am sure none of your candidates would care to be elected except by a majority of class-conscious Socialists—and that means waiting until the revolution shall be accomplished. Should any of your party be elected to administrative bodies they would, in order to justify their election, be morally bound to sit upon committees and discuss questions and administer affairs of the present day—of capitalist society—and that would be helping to carry on the capitalist system.

Reforms, of any sort, I gather from your paper, are not to be touched. No reform can be initiated, no new principle or statute enacted under capitalism that will be of use for any but the capitalist-class or the capitalist system. Invention and mechanical progress should be deprecated upon the same ground.

Sections of the population are physically rotten and rotting. To make them sound and healthy would, you say, but make them fitter wage-slaves; therefore let them die out! That they might also become more intelligent, mentally and morally sturdy, and politically apt, matters not.

The whole of your teaching may, in fact, be summed up as "Preach economic considerations as the sole factor in social development, and wait until the crash comes!" As for your objections against the S.D.F. and its falling away from councils of perfection, however maddening and regrettable such things are I am sceptical myself of their ever being eliminated from political life.

Yours truly,
G. FOSTER.

With a most amusing assurance our correspondent tells us we may as well cease to exist as a political party because, forsooth, he can see no reason for our existence.

Let us help him.

Though he rightly apprehends that candidates of the S.P.G.B. would not care to be elected except by a majority of class-conscious votes, yet he couples with it the strange assertion that this "means waiting until the revolution shall be accomplished!" Our friend evidently imagines that the revolution will be brought about by a class-unconscious proletariat! That Socialism will come upon the workers unawares, "like a thief in the night!"

Such a position can only be honestly held by those ignorant of the meaning of the class-struggle; for if the workers are kept ignorant of their true aim, and of the fact that there is a class struggle, how can they be expected to fight for Socialism against the master class when the moment of decisive and energetic action comes?

A political party that begs votes and support for anything but Socialism, that neglects to organise the workers for the class-struggle, that fails to bring about the revolution in the minds of the working-class that must necessarily precede the political revolution, such a party at such a time, will be as a bubble burst.

Elected to administrative bodies the candidates of the Socialist Party would have to sit in permanent opposition to the capitalist party, for, novel as it may seem to our correspondent, the

class-struggle cannot be abandoned because a few representatives get into Parliament. Genuine working-class representatives must carry on the fight for working-class interests and the abolition of capitalism, inside as well as outside the administrative bodies.

Reforms, our correspondent gathers, we do not advocate, but he fails to see that reforms are no concern of ours, since, until the Socialists are in the majority, we shall only get what the capitalist-class care to give us; whilst, when the Socialist working-class hold the political power, then we shall have Socialism. Nor this alone, for since no concession worthy the name was ever made to a subject class except through fear, the revolutionary method is also, all along the line, the most effective way to obtain even such reforms as are possible; for they will be thrown to the workers by the ruling class through fear of the revolutionary movement, and in a vain attempt to attract support from the revolutionary party of the workers. The crumb-begging policy of the reform parties is both contemptible and hopeless.

Our friend, however, is strangely muddled, for while he says we do not advocate reforms, yet he says "Invention and mechanical progress should be deprecated on the same ground!" That argument, surely, may only be applied to those parties organised for the patching up of capitalist society. We, however, decline to urge the working-class to undertake such Sisyphean-like labour, a labour doomed to be fruitless while the capitalist-class own and control the instruments of labour. Mechanical progress is not the enemy. The enemy is the class which controls and uses it against the workers.

Our correspondent fulminates because, in his ignorance, he imagines that we wish the growing physical deterioration of the working-class to continue. Not so, we are working for its end. Let us see who is going about it the better way.

The capitalist-class, ever cheapening production, dispense by the aid of machines with an increasing proportion of wage-workers, who, in turn, are compelled to intensify competition on the labour market, and so decrease the wages of those in work. Thus we get increased intensity of toil side by side with greater unemployment, and ever spreading poverty, resulting in an ever increasing deterioration of the working-class. The wages system is, then, the direct cause of the physical deterioration of the working-class. The capitalist being interested in cheap production will, so long as he controls administration, refuse to permit anything that cuts at his profits, whilst with international competition he could not if he would. Whatever measure is to the interests of the ruling class they may safely be left to obtain; but they cannot arrest the physical deterioration of the workers without committing social suicide, for its cause lies in capitalist exploitation itself.

More or less hypocritical efforts to rescue handfuls of the workers from this degradation will no doubt be made as sops to Cerberus; but the amount of degradation must inevitably increase much faster than it can be remedied, for, while capitalism endures, the cause still remains unchecked.

In a certain asylum it is one of the tests of sanity to give the patient a ladle and tell him to empty a tank into which water is running fiercely from a tap. If the patient has sense enough to turn off the tap he is judged sane; if, however, he endeavours to bail out the tank without doing so, his discharge is deferred. We are sadly afraid that our correspondent would not pass the test, for he would have us withdraw our energies from the abolition of the root cause of degeneration in order to make futile attempts to bail out effects while the tap of capitalist exploitation is still flooding us.

Our critic assures us that he has been a reader of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD for months past, yet a perusal of the Declaration of Principles appearing in each number must plainly show the nonsense of his pretended summary of our teaching.

Economic conditions form the basis of social development, and give rise to the class-struggle, a factor that our friend appears to ignore. It is inevitable that economic development will bring things to a crisis, but whether from out of this crisis will arise the Socialist Commonwealth depends upon whether sufficient of the working-class have been made Socialists, and have been

class-consciously organised. Obviously, then, to "wait until the crash comes" may be the policy of reform peddlars, but is decidedly not the policy of THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN. Our work is to assist economic pressure in making Socialists, and to organise these into the army of emancipation. The seed must be sown before the harvest can be reaped; and propaganda of scientific Socialism is as essential to the existence of a powerful, class-conscious political party of the workers as the latter is to the establishment of Socialism.

We can understand our friend's objection to criticism of the S.D.F., since his unscientific position is their position. The question, however, is not that the S.D.F. contains an amount of corruption that may or may not be common among political parties, but that that organisation has become a mere penny-wise and pound-foolish reform party, anxious to catch votes under any pretext, contributing materially to the confusion of issues on the political field, and no longer an instrument in the education and organisation of the working-class in their historic mission. It has become an obstacle to the growth of a revolutionary working-class party and therefore must go.

The paramount necessity for the existence of THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN should now be clear. It is to form the effective instrument for the emancipation of the workers from capitalist domination, and to educate and organise the class-conscious army that must aid in the birth of the society of to-morrow.

If our correspondent will ponder these facts carefully, and persist with his regular perusal of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, we have little doubt that he will presently understand the position a little better than at present he appears to do.

THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

NOTELETS.

The East Ham Branch has been formed. See Directory on page 8.

F. E. Dawkins, Sec. N.W. Ham Branch I.L.P., and Organising Sec. Ilford Socialist Party, has resigned these bodies to join the S.P.G.B.

He will join Romford Division Branch. This branch has also enrolled Barnett and N. Turner, whom South London Comrades will remember in connection with the Southwark and Lambeth S.D.F. up to eighteen years ago.

"In high S.D.F. quarters we hear of 'not unsuccessful philanthropy,' we are told we must preserve the monarchy, Alfonso is patted on the back, and some of us remember old times and rather wonder" says Herbert Burrows in *Justice*.

Some of us remember old times and rather feel inclined to weep. But we don't; we join the S.P.G.B. and work.

The S.D.F. have issued a manifesto on War, Waste and Corruption. No one questions their qualifications to deal with the last named, but why did they not bring it right up to date by including the Camborne business?

On the back of it they say: "If you are disgusted with present-day politics, join the S.D.F." Their present-day politics compelled many of us to leave.

Of course, the fact that the S.D.F. invites those who are merely "disgusted with present-day politics" to join accounts for their unsoundness and lack of definite policy.

Addressing a meeting at Redruth in support of the candidature of Councillor J. Jones, Mr. J. P. Lloyd, S.D.F., was interrupted with "That's all bluff." "Never mind about bluff," said J.P.L., "You're going to have a lot of it before I've done."

No doubt. But you can bluff some of the people all the time, you can bluff all the people some of the time, but you cannot bluff all the people all of the time.

BOOKS AND BOOKLETS.

ON POLITICAL COWARDICE.

"The Labour Party." By J. RAMSEY MACDONALD, Secretary to the Labour Representation Committee.

Our objections to this brochure start on the front page of the cover and multiply in the proportion of about ten objections per page to the finish. It purports to deal with the Labour Party. As a matter of fact it deals exclusively with the Labour Representation Committee—a very different matter. It is conceivable that the Labour Party may presently embrace the components of the L.R.C., but no Labour Party could embrace the L.R.C. itself, as that unhappy body is understood to-day.

Moreover the pamphlet is not even an explanation of the position of the L.R.C. It is an endeavour—and a laboured endeavour at that—to justify the existence of a body with neither principles nor programme, and with only the most nebulous of objects to be reached by the most ill-defined of methods. And although (*vide* a certain "labour" journal scribe) it is the "dark eyed inscrutable" secretary of the L.R.C. himself who essays the justification, we confess to not being greatly awed by his effort.

The impression the writer has succeeded in conveying is that of a man deliberately weaving words into an inscrutable (inscrutable seems a very apt word here) pattern in order that the real matter for consideration may be obscured, at the same time that the idea is fostered that the writer is an exceedingly honest person whose one desire is to lay bare the whole truth.

The Labour Party, we learn, comes "to deal mainly with the social condition of the people. A never-ending industrial conflict which necessitates standing armies of Capital and Labour, which drags into its heated and noisy vortex Press and Pulpit, Lawcourt and Parliament, and which throws out a constant stream of maimed and wounded and shattered humanity"—which for a prominent member of an organisation that repudiates the class struggle as "an obsolete Marxian dogma" is, to say the least of it, a noteworthy pronouncement. It is also a true one.

Very well. Now how is it proposed that this problem should be dealt with? Mr. Macdonald's Labour Party has no programme. We have this Labour Party therefore coming to deal with the social condition of the people without an idea sufficiently definite to be incorporated into a tangible proposal as to how it will proceed.

Here is a position bordering on the grotesque, and here Mr. Macdonald displays with marked ability his capacity for word-spinning. The Labour Party, he says, "has refused to compile a programme for the very sufficient reason that a party is not created upon a programme but upon a point of view."

And what is a point of view? Is it not the standpoint from which certain problems—in this case the social problems—are regarded? How then does the L.R.C. regard the social problem which Mr. Macdonald says it comes to deal with? What is its point of view? And the answer is that the point of view is not yet formulated! So that the L.R.C. comes into existence without a definitely ascertained point of view, to deal with problems that it gives indication of understanding, by methods it is not necessary (because it is not possible) to set out. "Parties are not built up on programmes!"

Mr. Macdonald is not strong enough to write what is obvious to any but the most casual of observers, *viz.*, that the L.R.C. is an organisation held together by no stronger tie than the desire of Trade Union officials and leaders of impecunious "Labour" parties, to secure political positions, and that it must fall to pieces directly it has sufficient honesty or intelligence to attempt to formulate a programme that shall definitely express its attitude toward the social problem with which it comes to deal, for the very sufficient reason that the great majority of the members of the various unions affiliated do not understand their position, and are still held in bondage by the political fetiches they have worshipped in their ignorance from their youth up. Consequently any move that might be made—and that must be made if the working-

class are to deal with the social problem—will immediately come into sharp conflict with the worship of the fetiches, and the result would be disastrous. Mr. Macdonald knows this very well, but he may not admit it without conceding the accuracy of the indictment of political impotency which we of the S.P.G.B. bring against the L.R.C. So that he is reduced to talking round his subject with the palpable intention of covering the weakness of his position.

The pamphlet to us, therefore, has been wrongly named. It should have been described as an essay on political cowardice. A.J.M.G.

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

PECKHAM.

PECKHAM and adjoining districts were once described officially as "a huge dormitory." The observation contained more truth than it was intended to convey. To awaken the workers out of the slumber of hopeless apathy which capitalist politicians, aided by reformers and pseudo-Socialists, have induced, we of the Peckham Branch are advocating the principles of the near approaching social revolution, especially by insisting on the necessity of a clear recognition of the class-war, in working-class political action, in practice as well as in theory. If in the determined pursuit of the object we have before us we have been compelled to regard and to treat as opponents the speakers of the S.D.F., the I.L.P., and the L.R.C. or other persons aggrieved, let them understand that we never shall cease to oppose them so long as they continue to obscure the plain teaching of Socialism that the political ascendancy of the working-class is the prime condition of working-class emancipation, or even of the alleviation of the miseries suffered by the workers.

Meetings have been held at Elm Grove on Thursday evenings when speakers were available, otherwise we have attended the meetings of the local Trades and Labour Council, and effectively elucidated the class-war principle by means of questions and criticism. The meetings of the S.D.F. have also been attended with the same object, notwithstanding unsuccessful attempts in this quarter to prevent criticism by the S.P.G.B. "Let truth and error grapple" is evidently no motto of the S.D.F., or why should they be so particularly anxious to avoid opposition? At the Kennington Triangle on Sunday mornings good meetings have been held. This spot must have persistent attention if the mischievous advocacy of nostrums, based on the assumption that the capitalist-class may be persuaded to legislate itself into political oblivion, is to be counteracted. No more fitting term than "impossibilism" could be applied to the wretched reform propaganda upheld by the S.D.F. speakers here. Large and successful meetings on Peckham Rye on Sunday evenings have to be recorded. The sustained interest shown at these gatherings proves how the straightforward exposition of revolutionary Socialism by our speakers is better understood than the delusive "palliation" propaganda.

On June 27th several members attended a lecture on Labour Representation by Mr. J. J. Stephenson (treasurer, L.R.C.). According to Mr. Stephenson, the election of Messrs. Crooks and Shackleton foreshadows the coming triumph of Labour in Parliament. Evidently conscious of his utter inability to meet the criticism offered, this protagonist of Labour evaded the points raised by deliberately bantering and irritating those who disagreed with him. We have publicly challenged Mr. Stephenson to debate, under conditions in which his discreditable tactics will not enable him to conceal the significance of facts or to ignore the soundness of Socialist principles.

The mass meetings of Sunday, June 18, on the Rye, addressed by Anderson, Belsey, and Lehané, were highly successful. About 800 persons attended the evening meeting, which was justly described in the *Dulwich Post* as "one of the best Socialist meetings ever held to our recollection." The report referred to concludes: "So finished one of the most intellectual treats we have ever had to listen to from young men supposed to be in a hurry. These young workmen are in earnest."

Indeed, we are in a hurry; we are in a hurry because we are in earnest. W.K.

ISLINGTON.

IS FINSBURY PARK "the happy hunting ground of quack theorists and freak showmen, ranging from the riddlers of perpetualism to the riddlers of Sissle, Frissle, and Fryers of the soul in torment," we have carried on our propaganda of discontent with and revolt against wage-slavery and capitalist profit-squeezing. Whilst having opposition from and debate with representatives of both Liberal and Tory tricksters, we have practically given the "order of the boot" to those pseudo-Socialists, who, after many years of vain effort, have had to quit the field. All the capitalist clowns and political fakers have strutted up nobly week after week to defend their "honorable" and "religious" system of pauper-making, and to quash this (small?) party of straight hitters and straight thinkers. We are desirous not so much of vanquishing our platform opponents, as to win the working-class by logic, reason, and common sense to a consciousness of their position in this class-struggle, and eventually to swell the ranks of the S.P.G.B. "The harvest is great and the labourers are few."

Our audiences have ranged from 200 to 800 in Finsbury Park, while the interest manifested at our Wednesday night meetings at Highbury corner, gives us great encouragement. Other branches please note that our one endeavour is to be the strongest branch of the Party, both numerically and financially, and to capture the "Northern Heights" of London for Socialism and the S.P.G.B. "FORWARD."

WATFORD.

In reply to numerous enquiries (kind and otherwise) I beg to state that Watford stands pretty much where it did and the Watford Branch is moderately well, thank you. Not very strong, perhaps, as men count strength (*i.e.*, by the number of heads that can be paraded), but strong enough to keep in good evidence through the medium of public meetings of our own and others, the latter providing us with opportunity for awkward question asking, of which we gladly avail ourselves. Indeed, so awkward do these questions appear to be that speakers on platforms which were once claimed to be "free," are fearful of dealing with them (although they are intimately connected with the subject matter of their addresses) preferring rather to take the damaging course of refusing to answer. Thus it will interest many to know that Mr. Daniel Irving, S.D.F., declined to reply on the ground that he knew the questioner (who happened to be Comrade Fitzgerald) so that we were reduced to fetching a platform of our own out and addressing a large audience from that. Mr. Glossop, S.D.F., questioned on the subject of the help his organisation has given to capitalist candidates, replied that he was prepared to support "Masterman, Dan Leno, or any other fool against a scoundrel like Lutherford Harris." Thereafter, with the connivance of his chairman (a local character afflicted with hysteria) he declined to deal with the matter further, or to discuss in public the unhappy position to which his organisation has brought itself, notwithstanding that he was appealing to his audience to join that organisation. They do not, they say, propose to wash their dirty linen in public, failing to see that a public organisation can wash its dirty linen in private only at the expense of any reputation for honesty and straight forwardness they may have, and failing to understand that the statement involved the admission of the dirty linen's existence, which hitherto they have been concerned to strenuously deny.

However, the editorial injunction (forcefully imposed) is that brevity should be the first law of branch reporters. Therefore I cannot give further incidents of the position here. But space may be allowed me to say that whatever our numerical strength may be, we can be relied upon to the last man to carry on the fight against capitalism and its supporters—cynical or sycophantic, conscious or unconscious—to the best of our ability. ENS. RATONIS.

WOOD GREEN.

Without a doubt the past two months have been marked by earnest hard work so far as propaganda is concerned. Our usual meeting place—Jolly Butcher's Hill—has witnessed some really good enthusiastic gatherings. The way our Party speakers encourage questions and opposition is highly appreciated, and has been

taken full advantage of. The latest development of the Branch activity is the opening up of meetings on Friday night at High St., Hornsey, which, so far, are a notable success. Our paper and the Manifesto sell readily, the first issue of the latter having already been disposed of.

In concluding this very brief report we record the satisfaction we have, in common with our comrades in other parts, in seeing the worker waking up to his true interest, and surely beginning to understand the hopelessness of the old capitalist political parties, and all those sections that are dragging at their tail. Our confident hope is that our Party membership will be considerably increased in the near future from this district. JOHN CHAMP.

FULHAM.

Although we have not reported for the last few months, it is not because of dry-rot by any manner of means. We have had some splendid meetings, our ordinary audience several times outnumbering the attendance at the mass meetings of other bodies claiming to be Socialist. Our straight propaganda, our keen criticism of the local "Labour" party, combined with an outspoken attitude on Trade Unionism is beginning to tell. The sales of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD have increased and a large number of Manifestoes have been disposed of. Our progress is slow but sure. We believe in making Socialists first and members afterwards. We hope by the time the propaganda season is over that we shall show an increased membership. Our Economic Class, though small, is regularly attended, and the knowledge gained is sure to be valuable to the Comrades attending. E.J.B.A.

WEST HAM.

We have had a lively month in West Ham, winding up with a visit from that promising young comrade, Dick Kent, who told us that he could not speak, and straightway got up on the platform and made himself out the biggest fabricator of the truth in the party. Keep a watch on this young man, Mr. Lecture Secretary; send him out into the highways and byways. We are getting considerable opposition now, and needless to say we regard this as a most valuable aid to us in our work, and we are nursing it and nurturing it with tenderest care and affection. Efforts are being made (not by us) to organise this opposition, and if these efforts are successful, "That will be Glory!" We have lately had two striking illustrations of the internationally fraternising power of the Socialist Movement. A short time ago a comrade from Poland, a member of the Polish Socialist Party, claimed the fraternal handshake and greeting. He understood very little English, but he understood that Socialism breaks down all national pride and prejudice, jealousy and hatred, that our platform is a barricade erected against the enemy that drove him out of his own country, and does not cease to grind his face in this, and that all are brothers in arms who march and serve faithfully under the red flag. It was sufficient for him that we are doing that, and for us that he was doing that, even if we could not understand a word of each other's tongue. The second instance occurred on the last Sunday in the month, at Forest Gate, when a young fellow came forward and said "I'm an American, and I'm a Socialist." "Shake!" says one comrade, "All round" says another, and all round it was. The new chum is a cowboy from the place that is said to be separated from hell by a sheet of brown paper, and he says he might feel "prutty wal at home en London ef ther durn brown paper edn't took fire." He was constrained to speak to us because he found us, to put it in his lurid language, "goin' fer it bull-headed en buck-eyed," which linguistic caper from the Wild West is not altogether unintelligible even in prosaic West Ham. The wild and woolly one has had our position made clear to him, and he seems anxious to "take a hand in the great 'round up.'" Having got the East Ham Branch into working order, we are leaving them to their own resources what time we look round for new worlds to conquer. We have put aside the spade and are taking a steam plough to the virgin soil at Leytonstone and Woodford. There is good prospect of our being established in both these places by the end of the present season. A.E.J.

P.S. Does any branch want that spade?

Printed by Jacobson Bros., 2a, Wingfield Road, Stratford, E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published by C. Lehané, Gen. Secretary, 107, Charlotte St., W.

Socialist Party of Great Britain.

LECTURE LIST FOR AUGUST.

SUNDAY MORNINGS, 11.30.

BATTERSEA, Prince's Head.
6th—H. Young. 13th—F. S. Leigh. 20th—J. Fitzgerald. 27th—R. Kenny.

FINSBURY PARK.

6th—C. Lehané. 13th—T. A. Jackson. 20th—C. Lehané. 27th—J. Fitzgerald.

ILFORD, Roden Street, Ilford Lane.

6th—P. C. Herbert. 13th—W. Gifford. 20th—J. H. Kennett. 27th—P. C. Herbert.

KENNINGTON TRIANGLE.

6th—H. Belsey. 13th—T. W. Allen. 20th—T. A. Jackson. 27th—J. Crump.

PADDINGTON, outside Prince of Wales.
6th—F. C. Watts. 13th—C. Lehané. 20th—T. W. Allen. 27th—F. S. Leigh.

TOTTENHAM, West Green.

6th—A. Anderson. 13th—R. Kenny. 20th—A. Anderson. 27th—A. Anderson.

WOOD GREEN, Jolly Butcher's Hill.

6th—J. Crump. 13th—H. J. Newman. 20th—R. Kenny. 27th—T. W. Allen.

SUNDAY AFTERNOONS, 3.30.

VICTORIA PARK.
6th—F. S. Leigh. 13th—P. C. Herbert. 20th—G. C. H. Carter. 27th—T. A. Jackson.

SUNDAY EVENINGS.

BARKING, 7.30.
6th—J. H. Kennett. 13th—P. C. Herbert. 20th—C. Turner. 27th—J. Kent.

EDMONTON, Angel Road, 7.0

6th—C. Lehané. 13th—G. C. H. Carter. 20th—J. Fitzgerald. 27th—T. W. Allen.

FINSBURY PARK, 6.30

6th—A. Anderson. 13th—C. Lehané. 20th—F. C. Watts. 27th—C. Lehané.

FULHAM, Effic Rd., 7.30

6th—E. J. B. Allen. 13th—E. J. B. Allen. 20th—J. Fitzgerald. 27th—E. J. B. Allen.

SEVEN KINGS, Station, 7.30

6th—P. C. Herbert. 13th—W. Gifford. 20th—J. H. Kennett. 27th—P. C. Herbert.

PECKHAM RYE, 6.30

6th—H. Belsey. 13th—T. W. Allen. 20th—T. A. Jackson. 27th—F. S. Leigh.

TOOTING, Broadway, 7.30

6th—H. J. Newman. 13th—F. S. Leigh. 20th—J. Crump. 27th—H. J. Newman.

WANSTEAD PARK STATION, 7.45

6th—W. Gifford. 13th—J. H. Kennett. 20th—P. C. Herbert. 27th—G. C. H. Carter.

WATFORD, Market Place, 6.30

6th—J. Fitzgerald. 13th—MASS MEETING. A. Anderson, T. A. Jackson, J. Crump, G. T. King and others. 20th—H. J. Newman. 27th—J. Fitzgerald.

TOTTENHAM, West Green, 7.0

6th—A. Anderson. 13th—F. C. Watts. 20th—A. Anderson. 27th—A. Anderson.

WOODGREEN, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 7.0

6th—T. A. Jackson. 13th—R. H. Kent. 20th—C. Lehané. 27th—T. A. Jackson.

MONDAYS, 8.30.

ILFORD, Roden St., Ilford Lane.
14th—P. C. Herbert. 21st—T. A. Jackson. 28th—P. C. Herbert.

TUESDAYS, 8.30.

CLERKENWELL, Garnault Place.
1st—C. Lehané. 8th—A. Anderson. 22nd—T. A. Jackson. 29th—J. Crump.

WEDNESDAYS, 8.30.

ISLINGTON, Highbury Corner.
2nd—A. Anderson. 9th—J. Fitzgerald. 16th—C. Lehané. 23rd—J. Fitzgerald. 30th—T. A. Jackson.

THURSDAY, 8.30.

TOTTENHAM, Victoria Crescent, St. Anns.
3rd—J. Crump. 10th—T. A. Jackson. 17th—J. Crump.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

CENTRAL OFFICE:
COMMUNIST CLUB,
107, CHARLOTTE ST., LONDON, W.
General Secretary: C. LEHANE.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Business transacted every Saturday at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W. Membership in the Central Branch can be obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmingtong Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmingtong Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—E. Philpot, Sec., 1, Coleridge Avenue, Manor Park, E. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Fridays at 8.30 at above address.

EAST LONDON (Central).—G. Fletcher, Sec., 305, Wilmoat Street, Bethnal Green, E. Branch meets every Friday at the Secretary's address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 34, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 49, Mablethorpe Rd., Fulham Cross, S.W. Branch meets alternate Mondays at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Thursday at 8 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—C. Thorp, Sec., 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Tuesdays at 8.30 at the Co-op Stores, 79, Grove Rd., Holloway.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at 83, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—J. W. Robertson, Secretary, 17, Ethelred Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays in month, Economic Class 2nd and 4th Sunday, at 3 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Park Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at Spiritualist Hall, 32, Dames Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

LECTURE LIST—continued.

—A. Anderson. 24th—C. Lehané. 31st—A. Anderson.

MILE END WASTE, 8.0

10th—P. C. Herbert. 17th—T. A. Jackson. 24th—J. H. Kennett. 31st—J. Kent.

WOOD GREEN, High St., Hornsey.

4th—T. A. J. Jackson. 11th—J. Crump. 18th—C. Lehané & R. H. Kent. 25th—A. Anderson.

SATURDAYS.

EAST HAM, opposite Ruskin Arms, 8.0
5th—G. C. H. Carter. 12th—W. Gifford. 19th—J. H. Kennett. 26th—W. Gifford.

WALTHAM CROSS, 7.30

12th—T. A. Jackson & A. Pearson. 19th—J. Crump & R. H. Kent. 26th—A. Anderson & Leslie Boyne.

WALTHAM ABBEY, 8.30

12th—C. Lehané, C. Thorp and A. Anderson. 19th—A. Anderson and A. Pearson. 26th—T. A. Jackson and A. Pearson.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Branches and members should purchase their literature through the Party Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W. Write for particulars as to terms, etc.

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

Printed by Jacobson Bros., 2a, Wingfield Road, Stratford, E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published by C. Lehané, Gen. Secretary, 107, Charlotte St., W.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 13. VOL. 2.]

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Readers who can endorse the foregoing in its entirety are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the nearest Branch or with the General Secretary. See Directory, page 8.

TRADE UNIONISM.

WHEREIN IT FAILS, AND HOW IT CAN BE RENDERED EFFECTIVE.

MANY are the discussions that have taken place on this subject between Socialists and non-Socialists alike. The question is, does Trade Unionism as we know it in Great Britain, help or hinder the development of the workers into class-conscious Socialists?

The answer undoubtedly is that it materially hinders it. It does not necessarily follow that because any Trade Union or body of Trade Unionists elect a supposed Socialist to an official position that Union has progressed in a Socialist direction. On the contrary, it is generally because this particular individual has swallowed those Socialist principles he may have understood, or because it is hoped his election to office may close his mouth and cause him to refrain from the fearless advocacy of Socialism within the Union and the exposure of the unsound position in which Unionism stands today that he is elected. It is then, not the capacity for securing jobs that is the test of Socialist activity, but the number of Union members who understand the root principles—economic, political, and historical—of Socialism, and are prepared to take action consistent with that knowledge.

Let us briefly examine what has come to be known as

"PURE AND SIMPLE" TRADE UNIONISM

with the object of seeing whether Socialists can honestly support it.

Socialism implies a knowledge of the class war which is being waged between the working-class on the one hand and the capitalist-class on the other, a war which can only be fought out by labour organised in a proper manner. The "pure and simple" Unions do not organise the workers for that struggle.

Paradoxical as this may seem, it is nevertheless the fact. In evidence let us take what is generally considered the wealthiest and most powerful union in the country—the Amalgamated Society of Engineers.

In the Annual Report of this Union for 1904 we find an increase of 703 members. This is the smallest increase since the days of the eight hours strike, a significant fact in view of the development in recent years of the motor industry. Mr. Geo. Barnes, the general secretary of the A.S.E.—fairly well known to readers of this journal as one of the many "labour leaders" who delight in rendering assistance to the capitalist-class wherever possible—emphasises this significance and urges upon existing members the importance of securing fresh members. But as the report shows, 4,517 have been excluded from membership! These are men who, by the aid of improved machinery, continually being introduced, can do work that previously only highly trained men could do. They can work for less money, and the A.S.E. excludes them therefore. All over London this spectacle of a Union working its own destruction by the

MANUFACTURE OF POTENTIAL BLACKLEGS can be observed, while at the same time in the shops of Harland and Wolff of Belfast, A.S.E. members themselves act as blacklegs to the

electrical workers by working under price, and this after having refused to undertake the organisation of the electrical workers, who are really engaged in a branch of the engineering industry!

In the slate club (or coffin club) side of this Union impending disaster is again apparent. It returns a monthly average of 5,427 unemployed members, 2,444 in sick benefit, while 4,696 are superannuated. Altogether a total of 12,567 members drawing upon the financial resources of the Society. On the year's working the average income per member is shown to be £3 15s. 9½d. against an average expenditure of £3 16s. 1d.!

The case of the Operative Bricklayers' Society is not more inspiring. During last year they lost 2,333 members, and the returns of the preceding three years show decreases also. The amount expended in strikes and lockouts for 1904 was £5,105 5s. 11½d. in excess of the previous year, while sick, funeral, and superannuation funds all have increases on the expenditure side. The jealous eye with which the bricklayers regard the masons, plasterers, and even the labourers, and the disputes which the Unions of these trades have engaged in, do not compel the conclusion that the O.B.S. is desirous that all workers in the trade should be in their Union, but even if it could secure the additional membership for which it is asking, on its present base it could not escape bankruptcy unless subscriptions were raised considerably. An appreciable increase of subscription, however, would inevitably result in the withdrawal of many existing members through sheer inability to pay, and the last condition of the Union, therefore, would be as bad as the first.

A further instance of how

PRESENT TRADE UNIONISM DISORGANISES

the workers can be found in the *six* organisations which the builders' labourers consider necessary in London. These, together with the three other unskilled workers' organisations also existing, necessitate the payment in the London district alone, in salaries, rent, etc., of eight times the amount that would otherwise be sufficient. In addition, of course, an enormous quantity of quite unnecessary work is caused, and much jealousy and strife engendered. Attempts at amalgamation have, it is true, been made, but without result, the officials of existing Unions being in the nature of things opposed to alterations that would affect them detrimentally, although Mr. Davenport, the general secretary of the United Order of General Labourers—the Union that opposed federation about three years ago—has fathered a scheme of his own. However, as the principle plank in his platform seemed to be the appointment of himself to the post of secretary at £3 10s. per week, the idea was not taken up with enthusiasm.

All the evidence, therefore, points to the fact that the existence of the Unions grows more and more precarious owing to the inability of Trade Unionists to appreciate the requirements of industrial warfare. Assailed on the one hand by capitalism, and on the other by the competi-

tion of the ever increasing number of men whom the Unions will not admit, they cannot in their present form survive. The question therefore arises:—

CAN THE UNIONS BE MADE OF SERVICE to the working-class?

The answer is undoubtedly yes. But their object must be the organisation of the working-class, not a select two millions out of an adult working-class population of sixteen millions as at present. All the members of the trade, whether they can pay dues or not, whether they be unemployed or not, must be taken in. Otherwise the Union will, as previously pointed out, be creating its own blacklegs. Moreover, organisation must involve the closest of associations between members of allied trades, otherwise, as happened in the case of the Operative Bricklayers' Society—which records 67 disputes to maintain trade customs, and four actions against reductions in wages during last year—we have the effect of any action nullified by the workers in allied trades remaining at work while the strike is in progress. The workers must be organised on a class war basis, that is, on the principle that there is and can only be, hostility between labour and capital. They must be organised to fight, not to form committees after the manner of the Bricklayers' Society for "closer union" with the employers—surely as absurd a proceeding in view of the fact that this Society expended about £6,000 last year in struggles against the encroachments of these same employers, as it is possible to conceive.

The position of Socialist Trade Unionists is clear. They should, it seems to me, endeavour to effect the

SOUND ECONOMIC ORGANISATION

of the workers by systematic propaganda of Socialism inside existing Unions—a work which, it must be remembered, has, hitherto, never been seriously undertaken. In the result should it be found that the "pure and simple" element, aided and abetted by Trade Union leaders, many of whom are interested in maintaining the present sectionalism among the workers, and are, as can easily be demonstrated, consciously playing the capitalists' game, are too recalcitrant for satisfactory progress to be made, there will be no other alternative left than that of forming separate Socialist Trade Unions and crushing the existing Unions from the outside.

Trade Unions will play an important part, perhaps the most important, in the overthrow of the capitalist-class and system. The political party of the workers,—the S.P.G.B.—while building up the political side, bears in mind the fact that both are essential. As we get nearer and nearer to the time when there will be a Socialist majority on the administrative bodies, particularly the executive of the nation, the capitalist-class will not sit quietly and watch themselves legislated out of existence. When we

REMEMBER FEATHERSTONE

Hull, Michelstown and Grimsby it stands to reason that they will oppose by all the means in their power the attempt of the class-conscious workers to capture the State machinery in working-class interests, and undoubtedly if the Trade Unions have not achieved their highest purpose—capacity and readiness for the organisation of production and the carrying on of industry—they will, when the Socialist working-class have secured their majority, endeavour to effect a counter revolution by closing down all works of importance.

Therefore it is all important that the economic organisations of the working-class should be as sound as their political organisations. Neither can be sound unless founded upon a clear recognition of the causes underlying and

THE REMEDY FOR PRESENT CONDITIONS.

Well grounded upon knowledge and thoroughly organised, the working-class, in the day when they have attained to the position of the dominant class in the legislature, need have no fear of any measures the capitalist-class may take in their endeavours to secure themselves a longer lease of life. They will be able to take over and work the industries of the country which the capitalist system itself is even now rapidly ripening for the change—in face of any difficulties capitalism may attempt to throw in the way, and so usher in the Socialist Republic.

E.J.B.A.

THE VALUE OF PRINCIPLE.

It is curious to note how large a number of ordinarily lucid thinkers go wool-gathering upon the question of the value of the State recognition of principle. So long as the State admits the correctness of the principle involved in any agitation, although it may cover years, although it may necessitate the expenditure of tremendous effort and demand no inconsiderable sacrifice, although it may occur that all the work has not beneficially affected a single individual of the many thousands they probably set out to benefit, these good people are satisfied that their participation in such agitation was entirely justified.

In connection with the recent unemployed agitation (which has culminated in the unusually useless Act already referred to in these columns) for example, the participants, undoubtedly comprising many honest and earnest men, profess to find occasion for congratulation in that the State has recognised that it has a responsibility to the unemployed—meaning that the State, through its Parliamentary mouthpiece, has admitted that its duty is to provide work for the workless. As a matter of fact the mouthpiece specifically repudiated any such responsibility, but assuming that the State had just as specifically accepted the responsibility, would that be a good and satisfactory thing in itself? Our friends say, yes, without hesitation, and argue that having admitted the principle it is practically impossible for the State to refuse to translate its acceptance thereof into action.

Those who take this line are probably unaware that it involves the admission that the capitalist-class—who, because they are the dominant class in the State are dominant in the legislature—are unconscious of the fact that they are rioting through life upon wealth they have never produced. Because if the capitalist-class are aware that they live by the proceeds of the robbery of labour, they know themselves as frauds. And if they know themselves as frauds they concede the principle that Labour is poor because it is robbed, and that they are the robbers. They are in the uncomfortable position, that is to say, which our friends seem to think will preclude their continuance in the robber role.

This, although the logical deduction from the proposition advanced, will probably not be accepted for the very sufficient reason that the capitalist-class have not abdicated. The only other alternative, therefore, is that they do not understand that they are robbers.

It is questionable indeed whether many of our principle-mongers (to coin a phrase) will acquiesce in that alternative. It is admitted, of course, that some members of the capitalist-class will not be aware of their position. It is also admitted that most of the members of the capitalist-class will not think the term "robbery" as applied to their method of getting a living, justified. But speaking of the capitalist-class as such, and having regard to the fact that they are generally possessed of good educations, it is a fair assumption, and moreover in strict accord with the evidence, that they know the wealth they live upon is wealth they have never produced. And how else can the individual who does not produce find the wherewithal to exist—and exist luxuriously at that—except by robbery?

If this is so we may take it that the capitalist-class have already recognised the principle that they live at the expense of others, and every indication available goes to show that they will only vacate their position as a result of forcible ejection. Now why is this if the recognition of the principle is the important thing that the principle-mongers would have us believe? What is the use of the recognition of principle if it does not effect a betterment in the condition of those on whose behalf the recognition is contended for? Is it not the fact that the right of every needy person to sustenance has been recognised in the British Constitution for several hundred years? Is it not true that the principle of equity before the law has been admitted for any length of time? Then why is it that needy persons cry aloud for sustenance and cry in

vain? Why is it that we have palpable administration of law in the interests of the dominant class? The fact is that there is as wide a gulf between the State recognition of a principle and its application as there is between recognition and non-recognition. Any principle can be admitted without danger to the dominant class—indeed, this class stands to gain by their concession, because they are thereby enabled to lull unrest by an affectation of concern for the triumph of Right—unless the power that enforces the admission is sufficiently strong to compel its practical application. And what power is it that can enforce the application of the principle of the right of every man to work and to the full result of his labour, except an educated, class-conscious, thoroughly organised working-class?

To this power and to this power alone will the capitalist-class finally submit, and not then until they have exhausted all the resources of force and fraud by the exercise of which they have hitherto been enabled to maintain their ascendancy. In the last resort it is not ethical considerations that will weigh as our friends seem to suppose. These have failed as they must always fail before the fundamental and all prevailing motive of material well-being. If it were otherwise the capitalist-class, already convicted of sin, already well knowing that their position is built up upon the exploitation and misery of the many, would have abdicated long ago. It is force, organised and intelligently directed, that will achieve the victory, and it is the Socialist Party of Great Britain that in this country is educating and organising the working-class to that end.

Therefore it is not the State recognition of a principle that matters when that State is capitalist. It is the recognition of principle by the working-class, and the intelligent organisation of that class into a power that can enforce the principle's application that matters.

Let our friends consider themselves. They are wasting a lot of time. A.J.M.G.

EVOLUTION AND REVOLUTION.

With the certain knowledge that his Socialism is in entire accord with the teaching of Science, the Scientific Socialist can afford to smile at the vain efforts of the "Socialism-by-the-farthing's-worth" reformers to twist facts to suit their interests.

Not only is the conception of history of Marx and Engels in complete harmony with all social history, but it finds numerous parallels in natural science. Thus Professor Darwin, son of the illustrious Charles Darwin, emphasised this fact in his Presidential Address to the British Association this year. He said:—

"His point of view was illustrated by a reference to political history. The degree of persistence or permanence of a species, of a configuration of matter, or of a State depended on the perfection of its adaptation to its surrounding conditions. If they traced the history of a State they found the degree of its stability gradually changing, slowly rising to a maximum, and then slowly declining. When it fell to nothing a revolution ensued, and a new form of government was established. The physicist, like the biologist and the historian, watched the effect of slowly varying external conditions; he saw the quality of persistence or stability gradually decaying until it vanished, when there ensued what was called in politics a revolution."

These considerations led him to doubt whether biologists had been correct in looking for continuous transformation of species. Judging by analogy, they should rather expect to find slight continuous changes occurring during a long period of time, followed by a somewhat sudden transformation into a new species, or by rapid extinction."

I attribute this great growth of semi-insanity to the horrible conditions under which so many people are born and live. A class is being produced that is devoid of moral fibre and of intellectual force. These people lead aimless and hopeless lives. And what, I ask, can you expect from the progeny of such as these?

T. HOLMES, Police-court Missionary.

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

THE POVERTY OF THE CAPITALIST.

A CORRESPONDENT forwards me an extract from a recent book of Sir Robert Giffen's for explanation. The distinguished capitalist statistician contends that the advantages derived from science and invention during the last 50 years have in the main gone to the working-class.

"Now," says my correspondent, "I wish you to show how this statement made by the highest living statistical authority in England squares with the position of the Socialist. You contend, as I understand, that the economic position of the worker is with every advance in science and invention becoming relatively if not absolutely worse. Who am I to believe—the highest of our statistical authorities, Sir Robert Giffen, or the unknown, tin-pot, little Socialist 'Economicus'?"

Before proceeding to deal with the main economic question raised in the preceding paragraph I wish to protest against the last sentence with its appeal to authority. Far be it from me to place myself against Sir Robert Giffen as a statistical authority. At the same time it may well happen that he is entirely wrong on this question and the Socialist entirely right. The whole history of both the inductive and deductive sciences is the relation of the mistakes of authorities. In no field of human knowledge has the authority always been infallible.

Not only is it the case that in physics and in metaphysics, in medicine and in art, the authority has been fallible but it is he who has been the most bitter opponent of new ideas and of new truths. Foremost among the revilers of those who put forward the Copernican theory as against the Ptolemaic in astronomy, the undulatory theory as opposed to the atomic theory in optics were the so-called leaders of opinion in those sciences.

It may well be then that in economics the statistician of recognised repute may be as little justified in his contentions as his fellows in other directions. The appeal in all discussions must be less to authority than to fact. Is Giffen justified by existing conditions in saying that the greatest share of the advantages of the science and invention of the last fifty years has gone to the working-class?

In modern society the greatest advantage that one can secure is the ownership of material wealth. It is around this ownership that the whole of our present-day life revolves. Wealth is the motor which sets in motion the industries, the pleasures, the pastimes, of the nation. Invention pertains more largely to industry than to any other feature of our lives. If Giffen's contention is correct we should find the worker owning a larger proportion of the national wealth than heretofore. The industries modified or revolutionised by invention—by improvements in machinery or in the application of electricity as a motor—should yield for the worker an ever increasing share.

On what grounds does Sir Robert Giffen contend that the worker receives such an increasing proportion of the wealth he creates? On the grounds of improving Income Tax returns and of improving figures from the Savings Banks! He contends that the higher savings in Savings Banks and Friendly Societies and the larger revenue derived from Income Tax show a continued improvement in the prosperity of the people of whom the working-class form the majority.

This contention would be unanswerable if (a) the accumulations in Savings Banks and Friendly Societies were the savings of the working-class; (b) any material proportion of the income tax was paid by the worker; or (c) the prosperity of the country meant the same thing as the prosperity of the working-class.

As to (a) I pointed out in the June number of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD that the Savings Banks contained in the main the savings of the petty shopkeeper and of the children of the middle class. When we find, for instance, as many as 50,000 depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank putting in £50 in one lump sum in one year we know that not one of them is a member of the wage earning class.

Similarly with (b). The worker does not as a rule receive a wage enabling him to pay income tax. Incomes of less than £160 per annum are exempt from the payment of income tax, and we know that wage-workers getting so high a remuneration are difficult to find. We have the evidence of Sir Robert Giffen himself, given before the Labour Commission a few years ago, that the average wage of the working-class was 24s. 7d. a week or (say) £64 a year. Our experience tells us and this opinion is somewhat strengthened by the investigations, among others, of Messrs. Booth and Rowntree, that even this sum is exaggerated.

The statistician studying rates of wages in his library is too apt to mistake nominal for actual wages and forgets to make due allowance for periods of sickness, short time, or out of work. When these modifications have been made, and every day they become of greater importance, it is found that the actual money wage differs very considerably from the nominal money wage.

With (c) I cannot now deal but on a further occasion I may be permitted to show that periods of trade prosperity and periods of national prosperity are not necessarily synonymous with periods of well-being for the working-class.

We see then that the grounds upon which our statistician bases his contentions are not relevant. The income tax returns will increase the more rapidly as the workers' wage goes down and the savings in the Savings Banks are not appreciably affected when the working-class is at its lowest level of unemployment.

The reverse of the contention we are criticising is that the least benefit from our increasing powers of production go to the property owning class. The poor capitalist we are often told is not doing nearly so well as is the man who works for him, but we never see any haste on the part of the capitalist to exchange.

We are told by Sir Robert Giffen and other "authorities" that the capitalised value of the wealth of this country has increased in the last 40 years from £6,000,000,000 to £14,000,000,000. According to this statement the capital of the country has increased during the last 40 years at an average rate of £200,000,000 a year.

Here we have a spectacle of capitalist poverty! The capitalist draws his revenues from industry—in essence, from the unpaid labour of the working-class. With it he satisfies his every whim, luxury, vice, necessity, and comfort. And even then he has an immense sum amounting to two hundred millions of pounds sterling to apply in further investment.

The worker, on the other hand, is enjoying with the progress of science and invention a speeding up of the machinery he minds, an intensification of his labour, a dwelling in the slums, polluted air in the streets, vitiated air in the factories. Clad in shoddy clothing manufactured for his sole use, fed on the poorest of food, he is told that the income tax returns show his growing prosperity.

The worker has a grim sense of humour but this must be too much even for him. Not always will he be content to produce the whole of the wealth and get for himself a beggarly pittance. He will one day awake to the fact that a parasitic class of rich idlers is fattening upon the results of his labours and he will then show the stuff that's in him.

When that time comes woe betide the capitalist class who have robbed him and woe betide the apologists of that capitalist class—the economists and the statisticians unable to rise above their own class interests. The day is rapidly nearing when those who produce the wealth will control its production and its distribution and may one of those who lives to see that day be

ECONOMICUS.

PARTY NOTES.

STIRRING reports of successful propaganda work have come in during the month. Several Branches record increased membership and in almost every district in which a Branch exists the activity of our members meets with encouraging response.

In Finsbury Park particularly, our Islington comrades appear to have swept the field, their meetings, entirely sympathetic, numbering from 500 to 1,500 people. At one such gathering 200 copies of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD and the Manifesto were sold.

The Manifesto with its admirable resumé of the historical development of the modern wage slave, its trenchant criticism of contemporary parties claiming to represent working-class interests and its clear-cut arguments in justification of the existence of THE Socialist Party of Great Britain, has evoked an interest far greater than our most sanguine expectation. Requests for it have reached us from most unlikely quarters all over the United Kingdom and the first edition of 5,000 copies is well on the way to exhaustion.

It will be unnecessary for me to emphasize the importance of every effort being made to maintain and increase the sales of the Party literature. Members will be fully aware that this is perhaps the most effective weapon in our armoury.

Another useful method of spreading our principles is through the medium of public debate. Before this paper is in the hands of readers, Comrade Fitzgerald will have upheld the position of the Party in opposition to Mr. Humphreys, S.D.F., upon the proposition, "Does the S.D.F. deserve the support of the working-class?"

Another debate has also been arranged with Mr. Wilson, Cobdenite, and our Peckham comrades are settling the preliminaries for a similar encounter with Mr. J. J. Stephenson, treasurer of the L.R.C.

With a regret that every member of the Party will echo I have to announce the resignation, through business pressure, of C. Lehané from the position of General Secretary. Our comrade has discharged the duties of his important office with an efficiency that could not easily be excelled and although the work of no member can be extolled above that of another when all are doing their utmost within the limits of their capacities and opportunities, the action of the E.C. in recording their high appreciation of Lehané's services will, I am sure, be most heartily endorsed.

THE ACTING GEN. SEC.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT.

The Editorial Committee of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD have pleasure in announcing that they have in course of translation, and will shortly publish, the famous

ERFURTER PROGRAMME,

BY

KARL KAUTSKY.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

To facilitate the transaction of the business of the Editorial and Management Committee, appointed by the Executive Committee of The Socialist Party of Great Britain to conduct its official Organ, members of the Party and other readers are particularly requested to address all literary communications to the *Editorial Committee, 34, Wilmington Sq., London, W.C.*, and all business correspondence, including Subscriptions and Advertisements, to *A. Anderson, 24, Belmont Avenue, Edmonton, N.*

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months	£	s.	d.
	0	1	6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion	£	s.	d.
Quarter Column	0	2	0
Half Column	0	5	6
One Column	1	0	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,



SATURDAY, SEPT. 2, 1905.

LABOUR TRIUMPHANT?

CLAP your hands for joy, ye people. Make merry in your hearts. For the hour of your deliverance from the insecurity of your position is nigh; the day when the heartbreaking search for work shall cease is at hand; the day when the misery and poverty always attendant upon unemployment shall be no more. Rejoice and be exceedingly glad, for the Unemployed Bill has passed the faithful Commons, has survived the ordeal of criticism imposed by the loyal Lords, and has found a place in the records of State Statutes.

Here is a triumph for Labour! Here a vindication of Parliamentary astuteness on the part of the champions of the workers! Here an example of what a few men may accomplish against overwhelming odds! The principle of the State's responsibility in the matter of the provision of work for the workless has been established; the State's duty to its profit-producers—deprived of the opportunity to produce profit—has been recognised; the State's sympathy with its honest and humble, hungry constituents has been made manifest.

A great day for Labour; a great day indeed. And the men of Manchester who demonstrated, the men of Raunds and Leicester who periginated, the S.D.F. who agitated and deputed, the I.L.P. who I.L.P'd, not to say the Labour M.P.'s who so ardently laboured, may take their meed of gratification from the knowledge that their united efforts have found fruition in an Act that has at last established the, for evermore, inalienable right of the unemployed, so long as they are sober, honest, and industrious, to—remain unemployed!

That is the net result of all the bother as we, without claiming the mantle of prophecy, foretold it would be. How else, indeed, could it have been? What other result was possible? It were easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for capitalist politicians to touch an unemployed, problem upon which capitalism itself depends. As well expect the earth to cease its revolutions as that a capitalist legislature should legislate itself out of existence by drying up the source of its power. The S.D.F. leaders knew this well enough. The I.L.P. leaders knew it; the Labour M.P.'s knew it; and yet they persisted in their policy of piteous appeal; persisted even when they knew the provisions of the Bill, born, as they claim, of their

agitation, and knew that it was, on their own admission, absolutely useless; persisted even when those features of it which the eye of faith in the head of ignorance plus the most powerful of microscopes magnified into points of possible utility, had been carefully reduced to nothingness.

Was ever such an exhibition of purblind puerility? And we who tell the working-class flatly and plainly that appeals to capitalism to abolish itself are stupid and childish; we who point out that energy consumed in such endeavours is energy wasted that cannot be spared; we who insist that the only effectual thing the workers can do is to get a grip upon the causes of their condition and then organize themselves upon their class basis in the teeth of the inevitable opposition the capitalist-class will offer,—we, forsooth, are the "impossibilists"!

Very well, we are the "impossibilists." If impossibility consists in determination to do the thing that cannot effect the result desired, we are the "impossibilists." We accept the epithet and all the opprobrium that attaches to it. Workers of Great Britain, we who tell the whole truth are the "impossibilists." They who squander your energies and divert your purpose and lead you into a ditch are the "possibilists." Choose ye this day whom ye will have as champions of your interests.

A CHALLENGE.

The statement has been repeatedly made both in the Organ of the S.D.F. and by individual members of that body, that THE SOCIALIST STANDARD has not had regard for the truth in its criticisms of the actions of prominent S.D.F. men and of the work of their organization. The most recent pronouncement to this effect comes from Cllr. J. Jones, S.D.F. organizer, who affirms that this paper "has been pressed into the services of capitalist Liberalism (as though there were a Liberalism not capitalist) to malign the prominent members of the S.D.F. in particular and misrepresent the organization generally"; but neither from Cllr. Jones nor from any other member of his party, nor from his party organ, "Justice" has any evidence for this accusation been forthcoming.

We are concerned that the rank and file of the S.D.F. and all others interested should quite clearly understand that THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is not in existence to malign or misrepresent anybody; neither is it prepared to lie in the interests of the organization it represents or in any other interest. It exists to speak the truth upon questions affecting the working class. Its views are the views of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, a party which consisted in the beginning, mainly of ex-members of the S.D.F. who, holding that that body had forfeited its claim to consideration as a Socialist organization by compromise with Capitalism and by refusal to abandon an attitude that could only retard the development of class consciousness among the workers, had felt compelled to resign their membership as the only way of escape from the grave responsibility that must attach to anti-Socialist—because confusionist—tactics.

Since its inception The Socialist Party of Great Britain has consistently propagated the principles of Socialism and consistently refused to retreat from its position of irreconcilable antagonism to every manifestation of Capitalism. In so doing it claims to be proceeding along the only lines that a party rightly expressing working-class interests—which are, and can never be any chance be other than, in diametrical opposition to capitalist interests—can pursue.

In entering the arena of political activity as a separate organization, The Socialist Party of Great Britain has, of necessity, to continually justify its position in the eyes of those—whether members of bodies claiming to be Socialist or not—who, through geographical or other causes are not in possession of all the facts—just as it

has to justify its existence in opposition to the orthodox political parties. To do so effectively it must of course make references to the actions of persons and parties from whom and from which it has been obliged to sever itself.

Such references we assert most emphatically have never been in the nature of abuse of individuals or misrepresentation of organizations. If it can be shown that we have been guilty either of the one or of the other, we are quite as ready now, as we always have been, to make honourable and straightforward amends. We invite Mr. Jones and the others to make good their allegations against us or to frankly withdraw them. In this connection the printed word is far easier of reference than the oral utterance, and as it is THE SOCIALIST STANDARD that has been accused of slander, vilification, malignity and misrepresentation the file of the paper is at the disposal of any of our objectors who desire to refer to it.

If Messrs. Jones, Quelch, Irving, or the other individuals concerned will not accept the offer we make, the value of their fulminations will, we think, be assessed at their proper worth by those who are at one with us in their desire for the truth to prevail. We throw out the challenge fearlessly. If there is cause for complaint against us as an exponent of Socialism we are anxious to hear of it. But we want the evidence of it also. Allegation without proof is not helpful. Let our accusers therefore state their whole case against us. We shall be obliged to them. But if it should happen, as we believe it will, that they cannot produce evidence for their charges, we ask the working-class to judge of the motives that will lead men to persist in false statements even while they are alleging misrepresentation against us. We ask the workers whose class interests we champion and to whom we belong, to constitute themselves our judges in this and to carefully note the character of the responses our challenge receives.

REMEMBER FEATHERSTONE!

The Britishers have proverbially short memories. Even when organised into Trade Unions they emblazon their regalias with such meaningless phrases as "Defence, not defiance," etc. If they were class conscious they would substitute the names of the battles they have fought, even though lost, with the dominant class. But they are not class conscious, hence the easy and well paid jobs of their "leaders," the decoy ducks for the capitalist party. How many of the workers, how many of the miners even, remember Featherstone? Yet the circumstances were such that they should ever remain fresh in the minds of the people, and be told and retold to their children and to their children's children.

In September, 1893, the "brotherhood of capital and labour" was proved by one of the most foul and bloody murders ever perpetrated by the capitalist against his "brother" labour. In connection with the lockout of the Yorkshire miners, one of those outward and visible manifestations of that class war which Mr. Keir Hardie and his friends declare is only a "shibboleth" and only a "dogma by which the Marxists set such store," an excuse was found by the Christian capitalists to read the riot act, after which British troops (not Russian, remember) armed with Lee-Netford rifles and explosive bullets, fired upon the people, killing two miners who, at the Inquiry, were proved to have taken no part even in the demonstration, but were returning from choir-practice. The Liberals were in office at the time and Asquith, the cynical lawyer, was Home Secretary. Challenged at Glasgow on 17th October, 1893, he ghoulishly "accepted the full responsibility for everything that had been done" and in the debate which shortly afterwards ensued in the House of Commons, his chief defender was the renegade John Burns, whom some alleged Socialists still support. But we urge the workers to remember Featherstone and also to Remember the Traitor, John Burns.

THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIETY.

From the French of EDOUARD FORTIN.

ONE single fact dominates the whole history of civilization. The different stages of this history (slavery, serfdom, wage-system) are marked by a division of mankind into distinct classes; masters and slaves in antiquity; lords and serfs in the middle ages; capitalists and wage-workers in our present epoch. The forms, aspects and degrees of this division change from country to country and from generation to generation, but at bottom the same fundamental fact remains—the exploitation of human labour.

A primordial and permanent necessity rests upon mankind, and Permanent and dominates all manifestations of their existence: the necessity of labour, the necessity of production.

As long as the processes of labour (breeding, cultivation, handicrafts) are in such a low state of development as to barely permit the production of that which is absolutely necessary to the existence of each individual worker, there can be no question of the exploitation of the labour of others. The men go frequently into battle; but no one cares for the vanquished, they are killed on the spot. Their flesh furnishes a banquet for the victors. Cannibalism reigns without cant or hypocrisy.

But the productive forces are ever growing, and this growth forms the principal dynamic of history. As soon as man becomes able to produce a surplus beyond his absolute necessities, this surplus is taken by other men. The vanquished foe ceases to become the direct prey of the victor. He becomes instead his slave.

At this moment one class begins to work for another class as a horse is trained to go under the bridle and spur of the rider.

At this moment the great battle begins between exploiters and exploited. It is not our purpose to tell the long story of this battle nor to picture its dramatic scenes. We are not here concerned with the heroic deeds, eloquent words, striking attitudes, or rallying cries of the principal religious, political and judicial actors.

Let us remember, however, that as long as possible the struggle was carried on outside the domain of actuality, outside the field of labour, in order to as long as possible keep within the "ideal" world of religion and politics, the realm of mysticism.

By this ultra-economic transposition the fact of the crime (*fait du crime*) did not change, but it remained concealed. The Philosophies of antiquity sanctified slavery. The Bible deified surplus labour when it declared, "In the sweat of his brow shall man eat bread." Religion legalized terrestrial suffering by the intangible promise of celestial joys. Only yesterday Guizot has dared to say "Labour is a bridle," to-day Tolstoy intones with the mujik Bondareff: "In the sweat of the brow shalt thou knead bread." If all this be true, to what purpose was the invention of mechanical mixers?

If mankind takes all these detours, and strays into all these vague and illusory roads, if it will arrive but slowly or not at all at the actual problem, it is because the material conditions of the solution (the immense increase of productive forces and powerful concentration of all the means of communication) are realized but very slowly with the progress of history.

But the solution grows nearer, economic facts develop prodigiously and the view of the contradictions born of the capitalist regime grows clearer every day. The exploitation concealed beneath the veil of wages becomes every day more evident to an increasing number of workers. The material basis of the revolution of the workers is now in advance of the individual ideas, and it is utopian to seek to delay the hour of deliverance. This hour will sound whenever the proletariat demands it.

When one considers all the things consumed, utilized or put in reserve each year by the totality of any country, when these things are reduced to their constituent elements, they will

be found in the last analysis to consist only of matter and energy supplied by nature, and labour-power supplied by man, and nothing more. No one can lay any particular individual claim to the fruits of labour are not thus divided. The blindest can see that the most savoury of these fruits are consumed by an idle and privileged class. In modern society, as in the society of antiquity, and in the days of feudalism, the pain and toil of one class afford freedom and pleasure to another.

Labour manifests itself by an expenditure of energy of muscles, of nerves. To consume the labour of a human being is to consume this energy—these muscles, these nerves; it is to eat his flesh and drink his blood. It is the perpetration in a new form—a final and disguised form—of primitive Cannibalism.

The bourgeois, the high-flyers and gluttons of the Bourse, are then exactly and without metaphor, but living vampires. Their profligacy, pleasures and voluptuousness are woven from the deep sorrows and afflictions of the oppressed class.

Under a regime of exploitation there are only three possible positions—either one receives more, less, or just as much as his labour creates. The excess of production, due to social co-operation, which properly belongs to no individual but should return equally to all, in no way alters this fact. There are three distinct classes: the great capitalist, the small capitalist and the wage worker. The first and last are alone radical. Any midway position is virtually theoretical: its equilibrium is as unstable as that of Blondin crossing the Niagara gorge; for one expert who passes, a multitude of inferior balancers fall into the depths of the foaming river.

Everyone knows that the intermediate class—the middle class—(the little manufacturers, property owners, merchants, etc.), which once constituted a buffer between these two extremes, is to-day buffeted to and fro until it is being pulverised by the competition of the great capitalist. The small capitalists are constantly being scattered to the four winds of heaven by failures and bankruptcies; no sooner do they rise in fortune than they fall again and roll hopelessly into the proletarian host of the damned. Soon there will remain but the two classes: capitalists and workers.

To each economic class there is a corresponding political party.

On top is the conservative governmental party, with all its factions gathered into one capitalist mass. At the bottom is the revolutionizing Socialist Party. Between these is the wavering, disappearing party of the small capitalist, a party whose economic basis is continually crumbling away, and which, in spite of the names it may call itself, is incapable of playing any radical rôle.

Just as the middle class falls away with each recurring day, just so does every day see the radical party grow smaller and weaker. The most far-seeing of the radicals are moving towards the Socialists; the more cynical, such as Yves Guyot, like clowns in the circus, leap towards the capitalist party, bursting the stretched paper of their old programs as they bound through the hoop.

The undecided ones, the sheep, continue to stammer forth the old formulæ in an indistinct murmur. The leader, the vigorous man of the party in France, Clemenceau, stalks on alone, in spite of the prestige of his double talent as writer and speaker, because he pretends to judge the movements of the social struggle from the super-human heights of the natural struggle.

There remains, taking all in all, only two real parties: the party of exploitation and the party of the emancipation of labour.

Our existence gravitates around labour as the earth gravitates around the sun. No sun, no planetary life. No labour, no human life. No

equal labour for all healthy men; no justice, no solidarity, no happiness.

The capitalist world and its partisans would perpetuate, universalise, increase the exploitation of human labour.

The Socialist world and its partisans would abolish the whole system of exploitation of human labour.

The first considers labour as a punishment, a muzzle, a disgrace. They do not wish to be punished, muzzled or disgraced. Their glory, their freedom, their honour rests upon the labour of others.

The second considers labour as a normal manifestation of life, as the indispensable condition of human existence, as the "medium of the material circulation between nature and man" (*Marx*), as the foundation for a harmonious development of body and mind, as a spice to enjoyment. They desire this work in an equal amount for all, and continually diminishing in accordance with the progress of technology and its practical applications.

There is no possible conciliation between these two worlds and the parties they represent. Choose between them! Join the ranks of one or the other of these two armies that are now confronting each other—the army of Capital, and the army of Labour.

The battle will never cease until there is no more exploitation of labour.

Then there will be no more classes nor class antagonisms. "The government of men will give place to the administration of things." In freeing itself the proletariat will have freed the whole of society.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

T.H.S. (Redruth).—The reply of Councillor J. Jones at the Meeting in the Camborne Division referred to is entirely misleading. The question put to him appears to have been to this effect: Was Mr. Lee, the secretary of the S.D.F., shown at the Shoreditch Conference of that body to have deliberately deceived the membership in connection with a certain matter of importance (the circumstances attending the withdrawal of Geo. Lansbury as S.D.F. candidate for Bow and Bromley to wit). If Mr. Jones replied "that is a lie," Mr. Jones is himself only just within the confines of the truth. The actual fact is that Mr. Lee was shown to have been guilty of a fabrication at the 1902 Conference of the S.D.F. and at the Shoreditch Conference in the following year he admitted the truth of the accusation levelled against him and announced that he would be prepared to lie again in the interests of his organization. That is why we asked in the issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD quoted from at Mr. Jones' meeting, whether Mr. Lee's indignant repudiation of the charge that the officials of his organization had accepted Tory gold on certain terms, was to be regarded as the utterance of strict truth or whether this was another occasion on which he felt himself justified in lying in the interests of his party. Mr. Jones will not be silly enough to deny the accuracy of this statement because Mr. Lee's confession was made in open Conference within the hearing of several scores of delegates and others, including Mr. Jones himself.

R. WALKER (Stepney).—You must not expect too much from "Reynolds." It is a Liberal new-paper although it angles for working-class support by the somewhat virulent championing of what it calls "Democracy." Of course it isn't democracy at all but simply capitalist radicalism or unofficial Liberalism. As you are doubtless aware, a capitalist state can swallow all the political reforms so strenuously advocated by "Reynolds" without discomfort and has done so. Certainly the working-class have not profited and will not. Capitalism has nothing to fear from "Reynolds." On the contrary, it is all to the advantage of Capitalism that it should continue to exist because the paper is a powerful aid to working-class sectionalism and confusion. Regret we cannot find room for your letter. The S.S. is a small paper at present and we cannot hope to publish all communications received.

PENKO PETROV (Tambol).—We have only received one card from you, and replied by letter on March 13 to your queries respecting the Countess of Warwick and the British Socialist Movement. If you have since sent us a letter it has miscarried. We are glad to learn of the successful Five-days Congress of the Bulgarian Socialists.

G. Foster (Stockbridge).—Letter too late for this issue. Sorry you are in difficulties, but that is doubtless due to your endeavour to weigh half-sentences. Only by taking the whole of the article and considering all the arguments adduced can you get a fair idea of the writer's meaning. Your random selections can hardly be called fair quotation, we suggest.

LITERARY CURIOSITIES.

No. 1.—Mr. Keir Hardie's Election Address.

MERTHYR BOROUGH PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION 1900.

TO THE ELECTORS.

Gentlemen, *

It is with pleasure that I accept the hearty invitation of the

TRADE-UNIONISTS of the MERTHYR BOROUGH

to come forward in the Labour interest as a Candidate for the representation of the constituency in the House of Commons.

The confidence and friendship shown by this invitation is an honour which I value as being far above riches.

WE ARE NO STRANGERS TO ONE ANOTHER.

I was among you endeavouring to cheer, encourage and strengthen you in the dark days of your recent great industrial struggle. Not many years ago, when during the Hauliers' Strike, the Government sent soldiers into your District, it was MY VOICE THAT PROTESTED against this in Parliament, when others upon whom you had more claims were silent.

My Programme is the Programme of Labour. My Cause is Labour's Cause, - the cause of Humanity, - the Cause of God.

For twenty-four years I have been before my fellow-men as a Trade-Union Official and a Political Leader.

MY RECORD FOR THESE YEARS is the best pledge I can give of what my future course of action will be. Whether in Parliament or out of it, I always have been, and always shall be found on the side of the Workers. I know everything that is to be known about the life and work of a Miner.

Born and reared in a Collier's cottage, and afterwards working for FOURTEEN YEARS IN THE PIT, I know only too well what such a life means, and I am not willing that any human being should continue in the life without further essential reforms.

I am a Democrat in Politics, and a Socialist in Economics. I first learned my Socialism in the New Testament, where I still find my chief inspiration.

Our claim for one representative is moderate and reasonable enough. In a constituency where we are in an overwhelming majority, we ask but for half the representation. Workers! in being true to me, you will be TRUE TO YOURSELVES! Let us, then, work hard for a great Labour Victory at the Polls on Tuesday next.

I am, Gentlemen, Respectfully Yours.

J. KEIR HARDIE.

Lochnorris, Cumnock, Scotland,
September, 1900.

TRIBUNES OF THE PEOPLE.

To those who follow the sequence of political events with anything like interest, the extraordinary mental muddle manifested by some of the men whom the L.R.C. are content to pay at the rate of £200 per annum (200 dirty pieces of gold as the chairman of their group, Mr. John Burns, has so amiably phrased it) in connection with the Unemployed Bill, cannot have escaped notice. Before it passed the Commons Mr. Keir Hardie rose to explain that he had no hope, personally, that the bill could be of any use whatever, but as Mr. Crooks was somewhat sanguine in the matter he would be prepared to support it.

After the Bill had passed, Mr. Crooks is reported as having given it as his opinion that he was afraid the Bill was of no practical utility. So that Mr. Hardie supported the Bill knowing that it was useless because Mr. Crooks thought it wasn't, and Mr. Crooks supported the Bill because he thought it was of some use and only afterwards found it wasn't. Of the two which laid himself open to the greater censure—Mr. Hardie for voting against his knowledge on the recommendation of a man who apparently had no knowledge, or Mr. Crooks for voting on a subject requiring knowledge before first of all obtaining that knowledge?

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

ROMFORD DIVISION.

Now that the East Ham Branch has commenced its useful career we can no longer claim the title of the Romford Division Branch, and this may be our last report under this heading. We who have been responsible for the hard slogging work in this Division have every reason to congratulate ourselves upon the results of our labours. Not only have the East Hammers been helped upon their feet, but considerable additions have been made to the membership of the parent branch. Since March, by dint of sheer hard work we have nearly trebled our membership, likewise our speakers, so that to-day this branch possesses five speakers capable of defending the Socialist position against all comers. We have lately extended our sphere of propaganda to Barking with every prospect of forming a local branch there before the outdoor season is finished, after which the market town of Romford will receive our attention. Sympathisers in district are invited to club premises any evening after 8 o'clock, when we shall be glad to make their acquaintance, and to put them in the way of becoming members of the only militant organisation in the district. H.C.P.

ISLINGTON.

The Islington Branch is well maintaining its stronghold in Finsbury Park, and we are steadily and surely convincing our audiences that we are the only party out for the entire abolition of the capitalist-class. Without in any way drawing the "long bow," I can report that our Sunday meetings have been among the largest meetings held in the Park for some time past. The great interest shown by the audiences, and their inquiring attitude, foreshadow a large influx of class-conscious workers into our ranks in the near future. Within one month of the issuing of the Party Manifesto we sold 310 copies—we will soon have sold 500. The Party Organ is selling well. We sold 65 copies of No. 12 at our first Sunday meeting in August. We assure our comrades, especially the Paddington stalwarts, that they will have to look to their laurels as we intend to head the list in sales of Party literature.

Our comrades have successfully repelled the attacks of every other political faction who week by week congregate here. We have had a Mr. Wilson (Cobdenite) in opposition to Comrade Fitzgerald, while Comrade Lebane has knocked holes in Mr. Sansom's (Tariff Reform League) facts and figures. Representatives of every party have an opportunity at these meetings of taking the platform against us and of showing where we fail to lay before the working-class a clear and logical position. Yet we still breathe!

At the corner of Highbury Fields, where we hold first-class meetings every Wednesday evening, there has just been erected a statue "In loving memory" of ninety-eight Islingtonians who died for their country in the last South African butchery. What of the memory of their widows and orphans? Does the sight of this piece of cold statuary relieve their pangs of hunger? Do their pinched and haggard faces light up with a "holy joy" when, instead of their bread-winner, they find a mass of comfortless bronze? The little children cry for bread and are given a stone!

It is our mission to do what men may to usher in the glorious days of Socialism, in which oppression and butchery shall find no place, but a joyous existence for all shall be assured. C. THORP.

WATFORD.

Fellow members of the Watford Working-Class, We put it to you that the organization which, claiming to be democratic and to have a free platform, declines to answer questions relating to its political attitude and refuses to defend in public discussion the position it has taken up (although it is quite willing to discuss that position in private) is an organization that has something to conceal.

The S.D.F. is such an organization. What it has to conceal may be clearly seen by a reference to the Manifesto of The Socialist Party of Great Britain (price 1d.) obtainable at the Sunday evening meetings of the Party in the

Market Place, or from the local secretary.

Can an organization be "democratic" and refuse to answer questions directly relative to its existence?

And what is the value of its claim to the possession of a "free" platform if it closes that platform to discussion?

What is the value of its claim that it educates the working-class when it refuses to use one of the best educational weapons it has—public debate?

What is the value of its claim that it organizes the working-class upon the basis of its class interests in opposition to the capitalist class when time and again it gives its support to the capitalist interest?

Can an organization support the capitalist interest and the labour interest when, on its own showing, those interests are absolutely opposed?

Can any organisation, except it lack wisdom or honesty, hold that it is serving working-class interests by supporting avowed representatives of capitalism?

An honest organization lacking only wisdom would readily champion its attitude in public discussion; but what of the organization which, having the evidences of its stupidity brought under its notice, refuses to discuss those evidences? Is it lacking wisdom or honesty?

The local Branch of the S.D.F. was formed regardless of the existence of the local L.L.P., yet no member of the Watford S.D.F. can show a single point of material difference between the two bodies. What then is the value of the S.D.F. protestation in favour of what it calls "Socialist" unity?

These are a few of the questions we ask you to answer for yourselves and to insist upon the members of the local S.D.F. answering. They will doubtless endeavour to stave off your interrogations by irrelevant talk of "abuse," "misrepresentation," "vilification" and so forth. When we ask these questions they call it abuse; when we ask you to note their replies they call it misrepresentation.

Do not, however, allow them to put you off the scent. Read the Manifesto of The Socialist Party of Great Britain and satisfy yourselves that we have sound ground for our impeachment of the S.D.F. as a working-class organization and then call upon them to justify their position or go.

THE WATFORD BRANCH.

Practical Socialism is so simple that a child may understand it. It is a kind of National Scheme of Co-operation managed by the State.

The postal and telegraph service is the standing proof of the capacity of the State to manage the public business with economy and success. (!!!) *Labour Leader Leaflet.*

Major General Franklin has been appointed chairman of the committee at the War Office to consider and report on the arrangements for the reception at home of invalids from the seat of hostilities in case of war. As a matter of fact, the existing arrangements are admirable. Our wounded are always received with enthusiasm by a grateful nation, and when the enthusiasm wears off there is always the workhouse.

Evening News.

Our criminals, our lunatics, our paupers, our confirmed inebriates, are all living under better hygienic conditions than millions of the sane, the sober, the self-helpful and the honest who inhabit the more crowded quarters of our cities. In plain English, the law of life is a hundredfold better applied in our prisons, our asylums, and our workhouses, than it is in the quarters in which our honest poor do congregate.—*Referee.*

The special attention of all concerned is directed to the alteration in the address of the Editorial Committee.

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to subscribe.

BOOKS AND BOOKLETS.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF A FARCIEUR.
MAN AND SUPERMAN, by G. BERNARD SHAW.

SAY my friend of the Civil Service, "You should read Shaw. He will broaden your outlook. You are too narrow and bigoted and pedantic. Marxists always are. Shaw faces facts. He doesn't blink them. His philosophy embraces them all. Read him!" Then came Mr. Bettany in the *Bookman* to say "Bernard Shaw . . . is a profoundly and persistently earnest person." So that I began to feel that perhaps Shaw had not been fairly treated. It occurred to me that the gorgeous buffoonery of certain of his contributions to newspapers and magazines, or the desperate nonsense of "Fabianism and Empire" which represented the sum total of my knowledge of Shaw's work, were probably not fair material upon which to base an estimate of a man's position. Alternatively it was suggested to me that if his position was as faulty as I then thought it, it might have happened that Shaw had considered the error, not to say the silliness, of his ways. How else could the *opera bouffe* Shaw become the profoundly earnest Shaw?

Therefore I have recently read the book specially commended to me as an example of the profoundly earnest Shaw, the Shaw of the great and all embracing philosophy, the incisive logician, Shaw. I have read "Man and Superman" and—I'm glad I obtained the copy from the free library and risked none of my hardy earned siller in a purchase.

The book consists of—
(a) An epistle dedicatory to A. B. Walkley.
(b) The play "Man and Superman."
(c) The Revolutionist's Handbook.
(d) Maxims for Revolutionists.

With regard to (a) there is nothing to be said except that I'm sorry for Mr. Walkley and hope he knows what Mr. Shaw is talking about. If he does—and as Mr. Shaw claims him for something in the nature of a kindred spirit, he may—he is probably the only one, apart from Mr. Shaw (although I am inclined to make no exception of Mr. Shaw even, in that happy (or is it unhappy?) position. He is the Superman!

(b) Is of so much importance to the elaboration and explanation of Mr. Shaw's theme that it can be taken out of the book entirely as extraneous matter! The play, in which Don Juan holds prosy converse with the devil upon various philosophic issues greatly to the discomfort of the latter, has no material connection with the conservation of the Life Force which Mr. Shaw is concerned to expound, and seems to have been introduced to fill the book out and to give the writer an opportunity for the manufacture of a few grotesque situations, a few flouts at what is known as respectability, a few gibes at convention, and a few sneers at Socialists of the type that Mr. Shaw has specially created for his own amusement, a type that exists only in the perverted imagination of Mr. Shaw and the imaginations of those who swear by him—like my civil servant—and who, although they heroically assume the label "Socialist" for certain genteel and cultured functions at which they can pose effectively as personifications of heterodoxy and advanced thought, know so little of Socialism and its champions that they are unaware that their leader has, to utilise a useful colloquialism, "sold them a pup."

Mr. Shaw's method in this, as in his other efforts, is the method of the iconoclast run mad. Every conception of good, every aspiration to the higher and nobler, is in common with the expressions of convention and orthodoxy, transformed into idols only to be knocked down and danced upon. The false and the true, the just and the unjust, meet an identical fate. Why not? Mr. Shaw has a reputation to maintain. He is expected to do these things. And he will continue to do them until the "intellectuals" whom he patronises and who patronise him, have found another god to break the idol, Shaw.

The play consists in great part of a tilt against the marriage convention. The man (Tannar) who is aware of the operation of the Life Force which makes man the quarry and woman the eternal hunter, has fled from the woman (Ann)

who, animated by the same force, has marked him out as the predestined father of the child she is to bear. She has overtaken him, and their courtship, so sacred a proceeding to orthodoxy, finds expression thus—

Tannar—And do you care for me?
Ann—Now, Jack, behave yourself.
Tannar—Infamous, abandoned woman!
Devil!

Ann—Boa-constrictor! Elephant!
Tannar—Hypocrite!

After which they marry! Their offspring might easily have been Councillor McAllen if heredity can transmit a predisposition to the use of similar language.

However, the play in this case is not the thing. The thing is

(c) The Revolutionist's Handbook. In it Mr. Shaw sets out his gospel and his philosophy. To him nothing matters except the production of the mentally fit. Physical fitness is subservient to, although he is obliged to concede that is necessary to, the mental. And Mr. Shaw, the facile and the incisive, works to his conclusions by the extraordinary process of swallowing the propositions of those whose opinions he derides as unsound and unscientific, although he endeavours to cover the weakness of his position with a profusion of "flashy" words and pseudo-cynical comments sufficient to gladden the hearts of the shallow pates who hail him genius.

We learn that although revolutionists make too much of the obstacles set up by property, the very first condition to the production of the Superman is that every person should be trained and *nourished* as a possible parent; which implies the abrogation of property because property in the hands of a class means the subjugation and enslavement of the propertyless, and produces the very conditions that constitute the problem, creates the very obstacles to the effectual handling of it.

Again, the practical abrogation of property and marriage, the two institutions having the greatest hold upon the mass of the people, yet the two which must be broken down before it is possible to successfully experiment in the procreation of the mentally fit, will, we are assured, occur without being much noticed, and this notwithstanding that "God himself cannot raise a people above its own level." On the one hand one of the greatest changes of all is to be effected without the people knowing anything about it, and on the other no change worth talking about can be wrought except by the consent of these same people, a consent that is dependent upon understanding, as Mr. Shaw is at pains to emphasize with predictions of catastrophe, unless we can have a democracy of Supermen! Which seems as intelligent a presentation as the Keir Hardie idea of Socialism coming as a thief in the night.

From whence then will the superlunary mental mechanism of mankind come, and how? Mr. Shaw apparently doesn't know, but he is sure it must be born of a woman (which isn't exactly profound) and must be the result of careful investigation and experiment (which isn't exceedingly helpful).

He talks of possible human stud farms, either privately or State controlled and the like, but he does not deal with the question of first importance in this connection, viz., *how* every person is to be properly trained and nourished as a possible parent.

The whole of his argument elaborately evades this point. We are treated to page after page of the usual fantastic and irrelevant flummery that will doubtless satisfy an "intellectual," but will hardly mislead a serious student even of elementary political economy.

The fact is of course, that only by the removal of the obstacles set up by the present form of property ownership can the conditions favourable to the birth of super-witted men and women be secured. And those obstacles can only be removed, as it would seem Mr. Shaw is obliged to allow, by an intelligent democracy understanding the underlying causes of the present property relationship and ready to apply the remedy.

And what are those underlying causes?

They consist of the private possession of the machinery of production and the consequent oppression and exploitation of the non-possessors of that machinery. And the remedy? Clearly the public ownership and control of the machin-

ery from which alone the property owner derives his power, and the exercise of which results in the creation and aggravation of the problem Mr. Shaw set out to deal with.

We cannot move a step without being forcibly brought up against the obstacles raised by property. Mr. Shaw may squirm and wriggle and throw off a cloud of words in his endeavour to escape facing the results of the contention which his desire to score off the low-bred Marxists has led him to make. But he will have to come back in the last resort to their position, and although he will no doubt carry off his own humiliation by a display of rhetorical fireworks of super brilliancy, he must eat his leek, nevertheless.

I read Shaw for the improvement of my mind, but Shaw has no material wherewith to broaden it. His wonderful philosophy based upon a recognition of the persistence of the Life Force is absorbed with the first milk of every student of biology. His indictment of convention and orthodoxy has no merit of originality. His pessimistic estimate of the possibilities of the working-class population is no more than the outcome of a superficial survey of industrial evolution, a survey that takes no serious cognizance of the dependency of all expressions of human activity upon methods of production, and that therefore neither appreciates the fact that the stupidity and apathy of the working-class are directly traceable to their centuries old subjugation, nor that the removal of the forces that keep them in subjection (the obstacles set up by property) will ensure their rehabilitation as—*if* Mr. Shaw pleases—potential supermen. Mr. Shaw has no message for the earnest enquirer after the truth. He has built his reputation upon an extensive vocabulary, a literary smartness that serves only to lead him into impossible positions, and a certain ability to lampoon. With sublime and characteristic conceit he has repeatedly asserted his capacity to bury the reputation of Marx. It would be wiser if he first of all took the trouble to read him.

The final few pages of the book are made up of (d) Maxims for Revolutionists, some of which are smart enough. But they suffer from the Shavian lack of discrimination already referred to. The method is easy enough. We take an accepted maxim, such as, say, "Honour thy father and thy mother and thy days shall be long in the land," and we change it into "Don't worry about the honor due to your father and mother or your days are not likely to be very lengthy." It would be no difficult task for a man with some skill with the pen to manufacture a few such "maxims." Set among some of the genuine articles it would, I doubt not, puzzle many of the most enthusiastic disciples of Mr. Shaw to divide the sheep from the goats.

However, the book will, I expect, find lodgement in the flats of the faithful and on the shelves of "culture." It is by G.B.S., and G.B.S. happens to be the thing just now. A.J.M.G.

NOW READY.

VOL. I.

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Well bound in stiff boards.

Post Free 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be sent to F. C. Watts, S.P.G.B. Literature Agent, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

Socialist Party of Great Britain.

LECTURE LIST FOR SEPTEMBER.

SUNDAY MORNING, 11.30.

BATTERSEA, Prince's Head.

3rd—T. W. Allen. 10th—R. Kenny. 17th—H. Young. 24th—F. S. Leigh. Oct. 1st—T. A. Jackson.

EAST HAM, opposite Ruskin Arms.

3rd—J. Kent. 10th—E. Philpot. P. C. Herbert. 17th—F. C. Dawkins. 24th—J. H. Kennett. Oct. 1st—J. Kent.

FINSBURY PARK.

3rd—C. Lehan. 10th—John Crump. 17th—C. Lehan. 24th—J. Fitzgerald. Oct. 1st—C. Lehan.

ILFORD, Roden Street, Ilford Lane.

3rd—F. C. Dawkins. 10th—J. Kent. 17th—J. Kent. 24th—P. C. Herbert. Oct. 1st—J. Kennett.

KENNINGTON TRIANGLE.

3rd—T. A. Jackson. 10th—F. S. Leigh. 17th—J. Fitzgerald. 24th—T. W. Allen. Oct. 1st—H. J. Newman.

PADDINGTON, outside Prince of Wales.

3rd—J. Crump. 10th—T. W. Allen. 17th—A. Anderson. 24th—C. Lehan. Oct. 1st—F. C. Watts.

TOTTENHAM, West Green.

3rd—A. Anderson. 10th—C. Lehan. 17th—T. W. Allen. 24th—A. Anderson. Oct. 1st—A. Anderson.

WOOD GREEN, Jolly Butcher's Hill.

3rd—R. H. Kent. 10th—J. Fitzgerald. 17th—J. Crump. 24th—T. A. Jackson. Oct. 1st—T. W. Allen.

SUNDAY AFTERNOON, 3.30.

VICTORIA PARK.

3rd—T. A. Jackson. 10th—G. C. H. Carter & W. Gifford. 17th—R. Kenny. 24th—G. C. H. Carter & W. Gifford. Oct. 1st—F. C. Dawkins.

SUNDAY EVENING.

BARKING BROADWAY, 7.45.

3rd—P. C. Herbert & C. Turner. 10th—J. Kent. 17th—G. C. H. Carter & W. Gifford. 24th—J. Kent. Oct. 1st—F. C. Dawkins & C. Turner.

BATTERSEA, Prince's Head, 7.30.

3rd—F. C. Watts. 10th—H. J. Newman. 17th—John Crump. 24th—T. A. Jackson. Oct. 1st—A. Anderson.

EDMONTON, Angel Road, 7.0

3rd—T. A. Jackson. 10th—A. Anderson. 17th—R. H. Kent. 24th—A. Pearson.

FINSBURY PARK, 6.30

3rd—C. Lehan. 10th—C. Lehan. 17th—J. Fitzgerald. 24th—J. Crump. Oct. 1st—C. Lehan.

FULHAM, Effie Road, 7.30

3rd—E. J. B. Allen. 10th—T. A. Jackson. 17th—F. C. Watts. 24th—J. Fitzgerald. Oct. 1st—E. J. B. Allen.

PECKHAM RYE, 6.30

3rd—A. Anderson. 10th—J. Fitzgerald. 17th—E. J. B. Allen. 24th—T. W. Allen. Oct. 1st—F. S. Leigh.

SEVEN KINGS STATION, 7.45

3rd—J. Kent. 10th—P. C. Herbert. 17th—F. C. Dawkins. 24th—J. H. Kennett. Oct. 1st—J. Kent.

TOOTING BROADWAY, 7.30

3rd—C. Fairbrother. 10th—T. W. Allen. 17th—F. S. Leigh. 24th—T. A. Jackson. Oct. 1st—H. J. Newman.

TOTTENHAM, West Green, 7.0

3rd—T. A. Jackson. 10th—A. Anderson. 17th—A. Anderson. 24th—A. Anderson. Oct. 1st—J. Fitzgerald.

WATFORD, Market Place, 6.30

3rd—F. S. Leigh. 10th—E. J. B. Allen. 17th—T. A. Jackson. 24th—F. C. Watts.

WANSTEAD PARK STATION, 7.45

3rd—G. C. H. Carter & W. Gifford. 10th—C. Turner & F. C. Dawkins. 17th—J. H. Kennett.

24th—F. C. Dawkins. Oct. 1st—G. H. C. Carter & W. Gifford.

WOOD GREEN, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8.0

3rd—J. Crump. 10th—R. H. Kent. 17th—J. Fitzgerald. 24th—C. Lehan. Oct. 1st—John Crump.

MONDAY.

ILFORD, Roden St., Ilford Lane, 8.30

4th—J. Kent. 11th—P. C. Herbert. 18th—F. C. Dawkins. 25th—J. H. Kennett. Oct. 2nd—J. Kent.

TUESDAY.

CLERKENWELL, Garnault Place, 8.30.

5th—C. Lehan. 12th—A. Anderson. 26th—T. A. Jackson.

WEDNESDAY.

Highbury Corner, 8.30

6th—A. Anderson. 13th—C. Lehan. 20th—T. A. Jackson. 27th—J. Fitzgerald.

THURSDAY.

HORNSEY, High Street, 8.30

7th—J. Crump. 14th—T. A. Jackson. 21st—A. Anderson. 28th—C. Lehan.

LEYTONSTONE, Lansdowne Road, 8.30.

7th—F. C. Dawkins. 14th—P. C. Herbert & C. Philpot. 21st—W. Gifford & J. Kent. 28th—J. H. Kennett. Oct. 5th—J. Kent.

MILE END WASTE, 8.15

7th—E. Philpot & P. C. Herbert. 14th—J. Kent & C. Turner. 21st—T. A. Jackson. 28th—F. C. Dawkins & C. Turner. Oct. 5th—J. H. Kennett & C. Turner.

ST. ANN'S, VICTORIA CRESCENT, 8.30

7th—T. A. Jackson. 14th—J. Crump. 21st—C. Lehan. 28th—A. Anderson.

FRIDAY.

PECKHAM, top of Rye Lane, 8.30

1st—John Crump. 8th—H. Belsey. 15th—H. T. Newman. 22nd—Humphrey Murrell. 29th—T. A. Jackson. Oct. 6th—H. T. Newman.

SATURDAY.

EAST HAM, opposite Ruskin Arms, 8.0

2nd—G. C. H. Carter & C. Turner. 9th—T. A. Jackson. 16th—E. Philpot & Jeffery. 23rd—G. C. H. Carter & W. Gifford. 30th—J. H. Kennett.

FOREST HILL STATION, 8.0

2nd—E. J. B. Allen. 9th—T. A. Jackson. 16th—H. Belsey. 23rd—H. J. Newman. 30th—John Crump.

WALTHAM ABBEY, 8.30

9th—C. Lehan & R. H. Kent. 16th—A. Anderson & A. Pearson. 23rd—J. Crump & T. A. Jackson. 30th—A. Anderson & R. H. Kent.

WALTHAM CROSS, 7.30

9th—T. A. Jackson & A. Pearson. 16th—C. Lehan & J. Crump. 23rd—A. Anderson & R. H. Kent. 30th—J. Crump & A. Pearson.

NOW READY.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 1.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN,

Containing, in full detail, a statement of the

Principles, Policy, & Rules OF THE PARTY.

Reynolds says it is "amusing reading because of its terse and graphic description of other Socialist and Labour Parties."

PRICE: ONE PENNY.

Post free, 1 copy, 14d.; 6 copies, 5d.; 12 copies, 9d. Special terms for larger quantities. Orders and remittances should be forwarded to the Literature Agent of the S.P.G.B.—

F. C. WATTS, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

CENTRAL OFFICE:

COMMUNIST CLUB,

107, CHARLOTTE ST., LONDON, W.

Acting General Secretary A. ANDERSON.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Business transacted every Saturday at the Communist Club, 107, Charlotte Street, Fitzroy Square, London, W. Membership in the Central Branch can be obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilton Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilton Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—E. Philpot, Sec., 14, Coleridge Avenue, Manor Park, E. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 at above address.

EAST LONDON (Central).—A. Jacobs, Sec., 79, Moody Street, Mile End, E. Branch meets every Friday at the Secretary's address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 34, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 49, Mablethorpe Rd., Fulham Cross, S.W. Branch meets alternate Mondays at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Thursday at 8 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—C. Thorp, Sec., 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Tuesdays at 8.30 at the Co-op. Stores, 79, Grove Rd., Holloway.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at Club.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—J. W. Robertson, Secretary, 47, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays in month, Economic Class 2nd and 4th Sunday, at 3 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Park Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at Spiritualist Hall, 32, Dames Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Branches and members should purchase their literature through the Party Agent, F. C. Watts, 154, Ashmore Road, Paddington, London, W. Comrades desiring to acquire or sell books on Social Science, etc. (new or second-hand), should send particulars to the Literature Agent, from whom the undermentioned unsoiled works may be obtained at prices stated.

CAPITAL.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION.

By KARL MARX.

(Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES.

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LABOUR.

By PROF. J. E. THOROLD ROGERS.

(New Edition, Revised, Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.

POVERTY.

A STUDY OF TOWN LIFE.

By B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.

(Illustrated by Folding Maps, Diagrams, &c.) (Published at 10/6.)

Carriage Free ... 4s. 6d.

The
Official Organ
or
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 14. Vol. 2.]

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Readers who can endorse the foregoing in its entirety are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the nearest Branch or with the General Secretary. See Directory, page 8.

THE INEVITABILITY OF SOCIALISM.

We are told by the poet that:—

"Two principles in human nature reign,
Self love to urge and reason to restrain."

Another principle which manifests itself as an essential feature of our common human nature is sentiment or altruism.

Now if we take these three principles and apply them to our everyday lives do we find anything in them which would lead us to hope for greater progress towards Socialism in the future than in the past? It is natural that man should strive to secure the good things of life—as he understands them—for himself. It is a platitude that the human heart is buoyed up with selfishness. Everywhere we are told that man is ready to secure his own advantage at the expense of his fellow.

A RESULT OF MAN'S SELF-LOVE

It is that he naturally envies his fellow who is more richly endowed with the good things of this life. When therefore we have a class who are living in a condition of inferiority to another class we must expect that sooner or later the former will seek for as good conditions as the latter. The working-class in every capitalist country finds itself situated in such a condition of inferiority. Whether it is the means for satisfying the physical, intellectual or emotional side of his nature, the worker is faced with the fact that he receives not the best but the worst which his time and country produces.

It is true that the rich are not altogether free from the evil results of their own advantages. A condition of their class privilege is the exploitation, or robbery, of the worker. When the worker has by his labour turned the raw material into manufactured product the employer takes the whole of the finished article as his own. Out of its value he offers—if he sees the possibility of personal gain—a small fraction to the worker to continue the work of producing.

THE CONSEQUENCE FOR THE WORKER

is cheap clothing, cheap food, insanitary housing, all of them conditions making for the germination of disease. But alas! it is impossible for the capitalist to give the worker a complete monopoly of disease. The air, impregnated with its germs, is carried by all the winds of Heaven even into the palatial residences of the rich. Here it meets with women and children possessing a hot-house culture, and the results are that the capitalist conscience is for a brief moment awakened. Soon, however, the heart of our modern Pharaoh is hardened, and the conscience is again lulled to sleep. With the worker, however, the trouble is everlasting. Disease is always with him and he tends to become angry with conditions which mean the loss of some loved one through the ravages of a remediable disease.

The spirit of altruism—the desire for the welfare of his fellows—is a characteristic of the modern man. We all know how quickly he responds to the telling of the story of some good deed, how he sympathises with the pathos, awe, and with the bathos of many a life history. His heart thrills when he hears of brave men risking their lives for the lives of their

fellows, his most popular literature is that wherein

VIRTUE TRIUMPHS AND VICE IS REPELLED.

Vicious and cruel actions raise a storm of indignation within him.

True, all these emotions are futile to prevent him from wrong doing, from, under the influence of competitive conditions, harming as much as possible those with whom he competes. But it shows that man once rid of his sordid capitalist environment would rise to a higher level both of self-esteem and of altruism than is possible in a society based upon the individual ownership of property.

When self-love and altruism combine in the mind of the worker to force him to seek a betterment of the economic conditions of his class he can by the exercise of his reasoning faculties acquire a knowledge of the means whereby such betterment is to be secured. He looks around him and sees the actual conditions of existence—the worker poor, the non-worker rich—and he is constrained to ask why those who do the work of the community are deprived of the fullest measure of enjoyment from the fruits of that work.

This question can only be answered by an investigation into

THE CONDITIONS OF WORK,

of wealth production. This study is two-fold, historical and economical. From historical research the student learns that present day methods of production are of no great antiquity. It is by no means permanent in its nature. He analyses the processes which have led from the old local handicrafts system with its mysteries and jealousy between rival towns to the world-wide capitalist production which now prevails. He sees that in the evolution which led to this result a revolution in industrial processes has occurred, and that the relations of those engaged in industrial operations have also been revolutionised.

Under the handicraft system the worker was the owner of his tool, and of the product of his labour; to-day the worker has ceased to own his tools. The machine has become the most important factor in production, and this is owned by a class who do not take any part in the production. As a result of this

DIVORCE OF THE WORKER

from his means of production, and of his possessing nothing but his power of working, a condition has arisen whereby he can be forced to sell himself in order to maintain his life.

Examining the actual methods of this capitalist system our student finds that so long as the system of capitalist production with its individual ownership of the means of wealth production prevails, so long must the worker sell his activity—become a slave—and so long must the corollaries of this slavery, disease, misery, want, poverty, and degradation continue.

The worker bringing his reason to bear upon the facts acquired by a historical and economic examination of wealth production will be forced to the conclusion that the element which is the cause of all the trouble is the fact that wealth is individually owned, and individually con-

trolled. As a result of this control the owners of wealth are enabled to monopolise all the benefits accruing from science and invention—while the worker is given

A TRAVEL OF AN EDUCATION

based upon the knowledge of two centuries ago. When he realises that he will purchase that it is only by removing this refractory element from our modes of wealth production, and taking social possession of what has become a social service, that is to say of the community taking complete ownership and control of the whole of the material conditions of life that a remedy can be obtained from the evils which beset us.

That this time is coming rapidly nearer is every day more apparent. A society based upon the communal ownership of wealth is coming every day more and more near. This society of the future will be based upon a condition which will prevent

A SORDID RIVALRY OF MATERIAL INTERESTS

between man and man. Competition for profit will have vanished. The antagonism of classes will have disappeared, and it will be possible for man to really harmonise his self-interest with the interest of his fellows in a society which satisfies his reason.

Life in such a society where man dominates machinery and wins more and more power over nature, wresting from her her innermost secrets not for the benefit of a few but for the good of all, will be pleasant and men will pass from the cradle to the grave free from any of the carking cares of capitalism. Such a life is possible only when Socialism is achieved, and it is the duty of every man to hasten the day which shall give humanity so great a meed of joy. R.E.

"ELECTIONITIS."

NOVEMBER is the month of fogs and fireworks. Why fogs and fireworks should keep such close company it is beyond me to discover, but without doubt there is some underlying and elusive link between the two, not only in the physical world, but in the mental world also. About the time of the November elections the fires of "revolutionary Socialism" are kindled in all directions, and there is a great show of smoke and yellow flame, and sometimes even a spark of red. Gorgeous wheels of fire revolve on the "revolutionary" flagstaff, and the workers, who are told, "this is revolution," regard them with awe; noisy Jack-in-the-boxes spit out spiteful things about the Mayor's blue nose and the Deputy-Mayor's whiskers, and call it "class-war"; a rocket swishes skywards with a fiery train like nothing so much as the tail of the Great Comet, and having soared gracefully up somewhere near the moon—the far-off moon that Socialists are reputed to be always crying for—hangs a moment and bursts in the face of that splendid jewel, and Oh! outlines it, obscures it with a profusion of richer gems. There is "Day Nurseries for Children," pale and blue and tender as the turquoise; there is "Free Meals for School Children," bright and burning as a woman's tears, and just about as efficient in improving the condition of the workers; there are "Work for the Workless," "Farm Colonies," "Municipal Milk Depots," and a galaxy of other glittering gems which bejewel the sky—for a moment. And few of those eyes upturned to watch the baubles fade mark the poor little spark of red that hurtles down with the falling stick—while as for the moon, why, that is as far off as ever.

It is the prevailing fashion among those who treat the workers to this confusing and befogging spectacle, to point the finger of scorn at the members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, what time they pipe, "What are you doing for Socialism?" And as there is some misconception concerning our attitude toward this mysterious form of "Socialist" activity which those who so fondly embrace it speak of as "political action," it might be not altogether inopportune to review the situation at this juncture.

The answer we give to those of our critics who approach us with the question "do you believe in political action?" is, emphatically, yes. And anticipating from experience the

complementary query, "then why don't you bring your actions into line with your belief?" we proceed to show that our present line of activity is in strict accordance with our pledge to work for the capture of the political machinery. It is too often forgotten that, since the science of politics is the science of government, all propaganda directed toward the enlightenment of the people in those causes which doom them to be governed, and in the only means by which the yoke of government can be thrown off (political means), is political action, and political action of the most essential character. We maintain that there can be no political success for the workers save it be built up on a knowledge of the futility of any measures short of the Social Revolution: anything else is mere electioneering success. There is no more common fallacy than to suppose that the man who is elected to place is the power of which the ruling-class are afraid or by which the workers can wrest anything from the oppressors. The true power lies in the quality of the vote which placed him in the position he fills.

It is the undoubted tendency where men fall under the influence of any particular school, whether in art, politics, philosophy or other sphere of intellectual activity, for them to become mere pedantic partisans; let us, therefore, in order to guard against this tendency, consider the position calmly and dispassionately, as befits men with the judicial mind.

I claim it as a fundamental truth, that the objective of every Socialist, as a Socialist, is the realisation of Socialism alone. As a husband, as a father, as a human animal, he has many other interests (I had almost written duties) but in his Socialist capacity none. As a man he may favour palliatives, the feeding and clothing and comforting of the destitute and suffering, but as a Socialist such matters are of interest only so far as they affect the attainment of his objective. That it is impossible to effect any other than an abstract separation between the man and the Socialist I do not deny, but it is necessary to make the distinction, to reduce ourselves to pure, abstract, Socialist atoms, blind to all suffering, dead to all emotion, as absolutely heartless as capital itself, in order that we may pursue our discussion without passion, and from the Socialist standpoint. To the scientist there is no such thing as expediency.

From the Socialist point of view the ultimate object of electoral action is the wresting of the executive and administrative power from the ruling-class, in the interest of the working-class, and the ultimate object is the immediate object also. As contributory to this object there are the matters of propaganda and testing the strength of the Socialist party.

With regard to the ultimate object—the seizure of the machinery of government in order that it may be used for the purpose of overthrowing the present system of society and setting up a Socialist system in its place, I take it that we are all agreed upon the necessity of this, since this machinery is the means by which each system of exploitation is enabled to outlive its period of social expediency, to indulge its tendency to resist the evolutionary processes and to stem economic progress until only revolution can remove the obstruction. As Socialists we can desire the capture of the political machinery for one purpose only—the revolutionary purpose of achieving Socialism. I submit then, that as Socialists we must insist that every step taken towards assailing the stronghold of the capitalist-class must be taken upon tested and sure Socialist ground.

Let us suppose a typical election campaign—there has been none other that I am aware of in this country up to date. A candidate is put up by a reputed Socialist body, and immediately there is a feverish desire to "get our man in": what can equal an election—as a sporting event? Literature is poured out, promising a whole host of palliatives and reforms, and the enthusiasts work like Trojans from door to door, urging people to vote for that which they know nothing about. With such a splendid array of palliatives they tickle widely divergent palates, even if they have not the skill to offer something to everybody. But the question that concerns us as Socialists is, does a man elected by such means stand upon safe ground as a Socialist?

It is clear that a vote given for a palliative is not a Socialist vote, nor is a vote given to Social-

ism by one who does not know the object of Socialism. And it seems reasonable to suspect the safety of the position of any elected candidate standing for Socialism who, without non-Socialist votes, would have fallen. The representative who cannot stand on his Socialist vote alone, whatever his position may be as the champion of reform, certainly is not the representative of Socialism, as will be discovered directly he takes Socialist action.

Into the power of such representatives to obtain palliatives, or into the efficiency of palliatives when they are obtained, we are not at the moment enquiring. We are dealing with this question as Socialists, chemically pure, if I may be forgiven, and as such we are concerned, not with amelioration, but with revolution, therefore, not with the obtaining, or the efficacy, of reforms, but with the effect of their advocacy and realisation in speeding or retarding our ideal.

The scientific Socialist realises that the return to labour, that is the total wage, is not arbitrarily determined, but must be subject to some general law. This law is admitted to be the law of supply and demand. Therefore any palliative which has the effect of increasing the supply of labour-power (we presume other things remain constant) must necessarily result in a fall in wages; and anything decreasing the supply of labour-power must have the contrary effect of raising wages. To deny this is to deny that the law which decides that the return to labour shall bear relation to the cost of subsistence is the law of supply and demand.

According to this law it would seem that all those reforms which aim at improving the material conditions of the workers must be rendered inoperative by their very own effect—other things remaining the same, of course—upon the competitive labour market.

Putting aside for the moment the question of how far other things would remain the same, we will consider which of the palliatives would have the immediate effect of improving the material condition of the workers.

All those measures which make for the better health of the people must, other things remaining unaltered, eventually result in the increase of the commodity labour-power in the labour market, there to struggle for recognition as a use-value, as all excess commodities have to struggle, and so doing compete wages down till the fall balances the advantage conferred by the palliative. The excess labour-power, in spite of every human effort that leaves the competitive labour market untrammelled, and suffers the law of supply and demand to ordain that the return to labour shall bear a certain relation to the cost of the production of the labour-power, must meet the fate of all other commodities that are in excess of the effective demand—must lose its use-value, and with it its exchange-value. Having no exchange-value and being a "perishable" commodity—it must perish.

No Socialist can blind himself to the fact that men, women, and little children of the working-class are dying in masses, employed and unemployed alike, not only from lack of food, but from want of pure air also, and of clean streets, parental ignorance, and many other causes, but primarily and fundamentally because capital can never recognise them as human beings, but only as present or future receptacles of the commodity, labour-power, which, being in excess of the demand, it refuses to support. Neither can Socialists, who, in the face of this, must recognise that the human intellect is strong only to destroy the capitalist system, and not to circumvent the laws upon which it rests, logically urge that the palliatives which would have a first tendency towards amelioration, can have any other fate than to be defeated and rendered inoperative by their very own effects.

All this, of course, is conditional. We have presumed for the sake of clearness that other things remain as before, but before we can finally decide whether the "palliatives" will palliate, and therefore what effect their advocacy and attainment will have upon the realisation of the Socialist ideal—the only respect in which they interest us in our Socialist capacity—we must enquire how far other things may alter or be altered, and how any possible change may affect our argument. This might be fittingly done in the next issue.

A. E. JACOMB.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondents MUST be brief.
Communications must be authenticated by name and address of writer and written on one side of the paper only.
The writers ONLY are responsible for the views expressed.

Larkfield, Chilbolton,
Stockbridge,
24.8.05.

Sirs,

I am obliged by your reply to my "useful letter." As the combined intellectual product of a whole editorial committee it is, to say the least, extremely disappointing. Confusion, as you remark, unfortunately does exist. On page 6 you say that "Whether the Social Commonwealth will arise depends upon whether sufficient of the working-class have been made Socialists and have been class-consciously organised." On page 3, however, we are told that "Socialism is the goal of the conscious and unconscious efforts of humanity." Your remark that I evidently imagine "that Socialism will come upon the workers unawares 'like a thief in the night,'" should be addressed to some of your own members! Socialist organisations are part of the social evolution. Not so the S.P.G.B. It has no part nor lot in the affairs of contemporary society. It is a party of evolutionists standing outside the evolutionary movement. Your public representatives—charitably assuming that you ever get any—will "fight for working-class interests" by holding aloof from the administration; your guardians of the poor for instance would not trouble to secure, say, the maximum amount of out-relief for the aged poor, but will allow anti-working-class interests full freedom. Reforms will then be given to the workers for being so good as to elect such non-interfering representatives.

I appear to have aroused old associations with those familiar Lunatic Asylum Sanity Tests; "strangely muddled" as I am said to be, I cannot understand, however, how manipulating the tap can be shown to affect the root cause "of the stream flowing through the pipe." Free Maintenance would screw that tap down pretty hard, but the S.P.G.B. whilst utterly impotent to deal with the source, obstructs and abuses those screwing down the tap!

The S.P.G.B. attacks Free Maintenance because it would provide the capitalist with more efficient wage-slaves! I say, therefore, that the S.P.G.B. must logically oppose every social re-arrangement or invention that will benefit capitalists in any degree, if such re-arrangement, &c., could be shown to make the worker more efficient! We need go no further than the same month's issue of your journal for proof. On page 3 one of your teachers tells us that "pure food would even do the worker harm by making him more efficient, &c."

The strait jacket in which S.P.G.B.-ism immures its adherents should be fairly obvious from this.

A party that tells the worker that pure food will do him harm, and also advises him to oppose any means for getting the best possible terms in life for his children in the meantime is not I venture to assert likely to gain the support of people whose experience of life does not include Lunatic Asylum Tests for Sanity. Whether you have "nailed a common misapprehension of your position" upon that post or not, you have certainly drawn a pretty picture of social evolution and socialist thought and activity as understood by the S.P.G.B.

Yours, &c.,

G. FOSTER.

It was, perhaps, unavoidable that the editorial note to our correspondent's previous letter should be "extremely disappointing" to him. It is significant, also, that he has failed to meet the main arguments in that note. We shall, however, spend a few moments putting Mr. Foster right on several points raised in the above letter.

On page 3 "Economicus" urged his readers to "join the S.P.G.B. and work uncompromisingly towards the goal of the conscious and

unconscious efforts of humanity." Now friend Foster actually takes this sentence to mean that Socialism will come without the conscious efforts of the working-class! Our correspondent is apparently unaware that the organisation of capitalists into Trusts, &c., albeit not consciously directed towards Socialism, has, nevertheless, the effect of opening the eyes of the toilers, and making an increasing number class-conscious workers for Socialism.

After saying that Socialist organisations are part of social evolution, and immediately contradicting himself, our critic adds that S.P.G.B. representatives "will fight for working-class interests by holding aloof from administration," presumably ignorant of the fact that the Socialist Party exists for the purpose of organising the workers for the control of administration. "Your guardians of the poor," continues Mr. Foster, "would not trouble to secure the maximum of out-relief for the aged poor." This is absolutely false, for, since the powers of local bodies are limited by Parliament, pending the capture of Parliamentary power, a genuine Socialist majority on such local bodies would secure, not only to the aged poor but to all workers, the utmost benefits that it were in the power of the local administration to confer. Whilst, until the Socialists have the majority, they must continue the fight for the control of administration, fighting for and taking all along the line (always however, as uncompromising Socialists) such palliative measures as the majority may give.

The sore point with our friend appears to be that we would not accept office under a capitalist majority, that we will not support capitalism or capitalist candidates; in short that we will not barter our Socialism for some hopeless promise of reform. It is indeed a curious idea that genuine working-class representatives can at the same time be the paid servants of a capitalist majority! And presumably our correspondent thinks the capitalist class will give the workers, if not Socialism, at least some wonderful palliative as a reward for their faithful support of capitalist candidates, parties and interests!

Mr. Foster falls foul of, and, as he says, fails to understand, our illustration of the futility of bailing out effects whilst the cause remains unchecked. Our illustration forcibly put the fact (which our correspondent makes no attempt to disprove) that the cause of working-class misery is capitalist exploitation, and we showed that our critic "would have us withdraw our energies from the abolition of the cause of degeneration in order to make futile attempts to bail out effects whilst the tap of capitalist exploitation is still flooding us." Yet Mr. Foster says, "that Free Maintenance would screw that tap down pretty hard."

Whatever its worshippers have claimed for Free Maintenance, it has remained for Mr. Foster to make the absurd claim that it would stop capitalist exploitation.

But what would Free Maintenance do for the workers? It would, it is true, if obtained, enable healthier and more children to grow into adolescence, but its good effects would be counteracted whilst capitalism endured, because it would increase the already great oversupply of labourers, and by making each labourer more efficient would enable the masters to employ fewer men; so intensifying the misery of the adult workers by increasing the unemployed and decreasing wages. We therefore point out to the worker that the increase of efficiency cannot lighten the load of working-class misery, because, under capitalism, every virtue of the worker is turned as a weapon of offence against him. Neither in promoting, nor still less in discouraging efficiency lies the workers' salvation, the abolition of capitalism is the workers' only hope.

We do not, then, oppose Free Maintenance, but we show that it would not materially improve the workers' lot; whilst, if the energy required to obtain an adequate system of Free Maintenance were directed at the root of the evil, such measures would be rendered unnecessary. Mr. Foster's premise that we oppose Free Maintenance and greater efficiency, being false, his conclusions consequently fall to the ground.

Mr. Foster places in quotation marks, and attributes to "Economicus" the sentence "Pure

food would even do the worker harm." "Economicus" did not say this, he pointed out that municipalization while perhaps ensuring purer food substances to the worker, would not enhance his power of purchasing those substances, and would even do him harm, inasmuch as it made him a more efficient worker, and enabled fewer of him to turn out the same quantity of commodities, thus accentuating the unemployed evil." Which, of course, is perfectly true. Such dubious conduct on the part of Mr. Foster we can only attribute to the fact, evident from his many references to the matter, that he writes obsessed by visions of strait-jackets.

It is further absurdly untrue that this party "advises the worker to oppose any means for getting the best terms in life for his children." Our mission is precisely to show the worker the best means for getting the best in life for himself and his children.

The S.P.G.B. working at the organisation and education of the workers for the removal of the cause of the growing misery, is abused by those who, in practice, consider tinkering, with effects more important than the removal of the cause.

EDIT. COM.

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

FULHAM.

A SLIGHT increase of membership, fair sale of manifestoes, and an increase in sales of Socialist STANDARDS are the chief items to report for the month. A Bye-Election is taking place for Sand's End Ward. The "Labour" Party are running a candidate (I.L.P., Ethicist, well-in-with-Progressives, etc.) Unless his opinions have considerably changed since the local L.R.C. was formed he doesn't believe in the Second Clause of the Declaration of Principles upon which he is supposed to run.

"Shall refreshments be sold in Fulham Parks on Sundays?" is the burning question, one of very great importance to the workers. The members of my own Union, for example, work such long hours, and the working-class in general, for whose recreation Public Parks are supposed to exist, work so hard that on Sundays they want a nap in the afternoon to recuperate, and if they come out in the evening they can get refreshments elsewhere. Needless to say we shall utilise the occasion to point out the uselessness of such candidates to our class, the contradictions and confusions arising therefrom, and to emphasise the only basis upon which a sound working-class party can be built. E. J. B. A.

TOOTING.

No great things to report from this district owing to the tremendous amount of confusion that exists, and the limited number of propaganda meetings held. (Only one week Comrade Lecture Secretary.) And yet with all we are building up a good branch, our membership is steadily increasing, our literature sales are good, thanks to the straight talk we get at our Sunday evening meetings from the speakers who never leave any doubt in the minds of the audience as to the position we occupy in the field of politics, always keeping the line of demarcation broad and clear. We are thus able to prove to the workers that their only hope lies in the application of the principles of the S.P.G.B.

The "alleged" Socialists have been trying to discredit us by telling the workers at one time that there is no difference between them and us, and at another, calling us an organisation of half a dozen discontents who want to have all their own way—Anarchists under another name. In answer we ask the people to read THE SOCIALIST STANDARD and our Manifesto, which they do with such good effect that "The Welcome Hall" no longer holds out a welcome to our traducers, it having been concluded apparently that they no longer deserve the confidence of the working-class.

Unless another Countess or some other novelty comes to their aid their life will probably not be of much longer duration. In any case our success is assured. A. B.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is now situate at 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N., to which address ALL communications should be sent.

General correspondence should be addressed to "The General Secretary."

Articles and correspondence submitted for insertion in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be addressed to "The Editorial Committee."

Subscriptions and advertisements for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, and orders for pamphlets, book, &c., issued or sold by the Party, should be addressed to "The Publications Department."

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office on the first Saturday in each month, at 3 p.m., and on the third Tuesday in each month, at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

Twelve Months	6	s.	d.
				0	1	6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

Per Inch, One Insertion	6	s.	d.
Quarter Column do.	0	2	0
Half Column do.	0	5	0
One Column do.	0	10	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.



SATURDAY, OCT. 7, 1905.

THE PARLIAMENT OF LABOUR.

THE Trade Union Congress—the "Parliament of Labour"—has met, passed resolutions, and also passed into the limbo of forgotten things for another twelve months. We presume this annual gathering of junketing labour "Leaders" has been named the "Parliament of Labour," because the delegates, or such of them as make a point of being present during the sittings, indulge in a "tumult of words," and listen "listlessly" to the pro and con arguments used?

457 delegates, representing 1,561,800 work-people, assembled in Congress and submitted to the clap-trap of the Mayor of Hanley, who, in his address of welcome, declared that "there would be a danger if labour was at the top, but the intelligence represented would guide them how far to go and where to stop." That no delegate emphasised the first point, that "there would be a danger" (to the capitalist class and its parasites) "if labour was at the top" was, we suppose, due to the aforementioned functionary's allusion to the "intelligence represented."

The president's address was a disappointment even to those professing Socialists who claim to have discovered "How to put New Life into Trade Unionism." It left the real issue severely alone, as might be expected of one who regards working-class politics as "shop," and was mainly notable for its unqualified eulogy of the leadership of the Labour Party (whoever they may be) in the House of Commons by John Burns, that traitor to the working-class, that "official Liberal in all but name," who recently expressed, in a manner more forcible than polite, his opinion of Sexton & Co. as those "who had sold themselves, or were anxious to sell themselves, for 200 dirty pieces of gold" and the sellers and would-be sellers promptly elected their denouncer as their leader, and Sexton carried the whipped-dog attitude a step further.

In one respect, at least, the "Parliament of Labour" is like unto the Parliament of Capital—it likes the junketings and the jollifications.

At the moment when the misguided Liverpool dockers were going back to work upon the employers' terms, after a strike of eleven weeks duration, their official and "leader," Sexton, was proposing a vote of thanks to the Duke and Duchess of Sutherland (who took good care to be absent) for the kind consideration which they had shown by allowing the delegates to inspect Trentham Hall, and by the hospitality provided. Would, we ask, a class-conscious working-class accept favours from its plunderers and their parasites. To answer in the only truthful manner is to admit that the workers are as yet class-unconscious, and that their "leaders" are equally so—or humbugs.

The resolutions passed by the Congress consisted in the main of the usual appeals to the capitalists to make a few concessions to their ever humble and obedient servants, the "organised" workers of the Kingdom, and their petitioners will ever pray. Of course they will, just as the petitioned will refuse to answer the prayer until they have become convinced that their class interests demand that such concessions, for what little they are worth, shall be, and can safely be, made.

There was the resolution concerning fiscal policy, in which it was declared that "any departure from the principles of Free Trade would be detrimental to the interests of the working-classes . . . and injurious to the prosperity of the nation as a whole." This was ultimately carried by 1,253,000 votes to 26,000, and alleged Socialists, prominent members of organisations claiming to be Socialist, spoke and voted for it, despite manifestoes issued by their organisations in which it has been rightly pointed out that under capitalism the working-class must be plundered by either the Free Trade Crows or Protectionist Kites. For those claiming intimate and first hand acquaintanceship with the condition of the people to talk of the "prosperity of the people" is bad enough, but what can be thought of those claiming to be out for independent and anti-capitalist political action deliberately playing into the hands of the Liberals as they did. If the maintenance of Free Trade is of such vital importance to the working-class, then it is of vital importance that those who are in favour of altering our Fiscal System should be kept out of the House of Commons, and that those who are against "any departure from the principles of Free Trade" should be put in. The Trade Unionists are therefore bound, in honour, to support Free Traders, i.e.,—the Liberals—as against the Tariff Reformers—the Conservatives. No wonder the Liberal press was so jubilant at the voting.

The result of the election for Secretary to the Parliamentary Committee would cause one to laugh heartily—if it were not so sad.

The work of the Committee is to carry out the resolutions of the Congress, which, by the way, it has never done. More particularly its function is to push forward those reforms which Congress thinks can be secured by political action. Congress has already decided that that political action shall be distinct from the capitalist sections, although it has failed to take the necessary steps to secure this. It gave birth to the Labour Representation Committee, whose candidates are pledged "to abstain strictly from identifying themselves with, or promoting the interests of, any section of the Liberal or Conservative Parties." And having done this, it elects as its Parliamentary Secretary, W. C. Steadman, who has always identified himself with the Liberals, who has even refused to sign the L.R.C. declaration, and is, therefore, not an official L.R.C. candidate, although he is the London Trades Council candidate for

Finsbury, which body affiliated to the L.R.C. Steadman is a Liberal, and makes no pretence of being anything else. As the *Daily Chronicle* once remarked "he is a simple, honest, working man." He is, and is, therefore, exceedingly useful to the Liberals, who, and again no wonder, are so jubilant that their decoy-duck has been selected for this position. The loud cheers from the Congress when Steadman, in returning thanks, pointed out that, as an ex-Member of Parliament, he had not only the entry to the inner lobby, but also the right to interview *even Cabinet Ministers* on behalf of the Congress, conclusively proved that these people have no conception of the real issue, or, if they have that they are deliberately confusing it, and the London Trades Council, through its "Socialist" chairman, who, before he occupied so important a position in the Trade Union Movement declared that the non-Socialist Trade Unionist "is the type of labour representative of whom we had better have none at all," that they are "flunkys and sycophants, who ape the airs of their masters, while they contain and misrepresent the class in whose name they claim to speak," now voices the appreciation of the London Trades Council that their Treasurer, their Liberal-Labour (candidate, has been honoured by being selected for this "plum" job of the labour movement, and declares in the current issue of *A Monthly Socialist Review*, that Steadman, who, throughout the whole of his political career has sided with and supported and acted the decoy-duck and the jackal for the capitalist-class, "has never turned his back upon his class!"

The real fact is, of course, that the "organised" working-class are just as devoid of a real conception of their class interests as are the unorganised. They have not yet grasped the fact that all the working-class are at war with the international capitalist-class, and must line up in battle array to prepare for the final struggle. Leaders of sectional interests such as find expression in Trade Unionism, Unemployed Agitations, Free Labourism, and the like, are all misleaders of the working-class. The organisation of the working-class, to be an effective weapon with which to break down the power of the capitalist-class, must be, industrially and politically, not in sections, but as a class, whether the working-class are skilled or unskilled, permanent or casual labourers, employed or unemployed, their interests all over the world are identical. It does not serve the purpose of their various "leaders" that this should be recognised by the working-class. When this is understood, when the underlying causes of the change of front on the part of certain one time Socialists are made plain, sound Socialists will not only not be discouraged, but all the more determined to carry on the fight. Much spade work has yet to be done, but when once the working-class recognise that their only hopes lie in their industrial and political organisation on the basis of the class-war, it will go hard with some of the job hunters, the lick-spittles, and the decoy-ducks.

The resolutions passed at the Trade Union Congress, even if embodied in Acts of Parliament through the good offices of Steadman, grovelling in the inner lobby before a capitalist Cabinet Minister, would in no way alter the relative positions of capital and labour. So long as the capitalist system obtains the workers will be deprived of the results of their labour, and will be poor. Nothing but the ownership by the people of the means of producing and distributing wealth will solve the social problem, and this must be brought about by the workers themselves, organised on the lines laid down by The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

A LOOK ROUND.

THE Registration Courts are being held, and many citizens of this "free" country are striving to secure or to retain that very questionable advantage, under present conditions, the vote!

The Liberals tell us they are in favour of the franchise. They claim to have been foremost in extending it and to desire to still further extend it. The depth of their sincerity may be gauged by the fact that their paid agents are striving at the present moment to keep men off the Register!

I have frequently commented upon the flabbiness of the speeches and election literature of some candidates claiming to be Socialists. Even the *Labour Leader* is now compelled to protest. It says "The contrast between the substance of the teaching at the innumerable propaganda meetings of the L.L.P., where the power of the movement is created, and the substance of the addresses by some of our candidates claiming to be Socialist and Trade Unionists, is as between an honest dinner and a dish of skilly. Constant complaints reach us on this matter. So cautious to timidity, so practical to the utter iteration of commonplace vestry politics, have the deliverances of many of our candidates become, that quite frequently the speeches of their capitalist opponents are the more inspiring of the two."

As most of these "Socialist" candidates have their eyes longingly fixed upon the loaves and fishes of the L.R.C., they are more concerned about becoming M.P.'s than creating a class-conscious Socialist army. Let it be clearly understood that none of them is a member of the S.P.G.B.

The Trade Union Congress led one of the capitalist sheets to discourse upon the number of "Labour" journals in existence, specially mentioning *The Labour Record and Review*, edited by F. W. Pethick Lawrence. A few days after Mr. Lawrence was announced to speak at Holmwood, under the auspices of the Home Counties Liberal Association. Is his "Labour" paper edited in the interests of Liberalism or of Labour?

"What is wrong?" The discussion upon this will doubtless continue until Parliament re-assembles or the space is required for other gas. One of the participants writes, "When we practise true Christian Socialism—What I have I give unto thee"—all that is now wrong will become right."

So that the social problem is to be solved by everybody who has anything giving it to somebody else, then the givers will have nothing and the given-to something which they can give back to those who have nothing, and so on to the end of the chapter. This may be Christian but it isn't Socialism.

I am reminded of a lecture upon "Christian Socialism" once delivered by the Rev. Stewart Headlam for the Fabian Society, in which he quoted the saying of Christ "Sell all thou hast and give to the poor" as a proof that Jesus was a Socialist! All that was wanted was the universal adoption of this teaching—real Christianity—and Socialism would be here. When asked who would buy, supposing all became "real" Christians and proceeded to sell all that they had in order to give to the poor, he gave it up.

Socialism is an economic transformation, desired by those who wish to remove all hindrances to human development. It is concerned with the material things of life because "the basal factor determining the constitution of society is its material and economic condition." It is neither "Christian" nor "Atheist."

Messrs. Rowntree, of York, are "considerate" employers. They run what the *Clarion* terms a "cocoa oasis in the desert," and, be it noted,

advertise in the *Clarion*. The firm admit that their consideration "pays," and I presume employees, they state, are on piece work, and if one is found not to be earning a reasonable minimum, special investigation is made into his case, and a remedy discovered. There are many employees working upon piece who, for want of arrangement, or help, or stimulation of some kind, would go on year after year, earning a comparatively low wage, although they are perfectly capable of earning a higher wage if the necessary help be given by the employer, and this without any alteration in the piece rate.

In the dining rooms, cheap meals are provided, and large numbers use them. The firm lose by this considerably, but they say, "Some material return for this expenditure is no doubt obtained, inasmuch as employees who have had a nutritious dinner in a comfortable and well ventilated room are more vigorous and fit for their work than they otherwise would be. The advantage which the firm derives from this circumstance must be considerable."

Messrs. Rowntree, Cadbury, Lever and Co. are farsighted capitalists who see that it is an economic advantage to them to palliate the evils of the capitalist system. But their workers are still slaves, can still be dismissed and turned out to starve at the will of their masters. And owing to the better conditions under which they work they are enabled to do better work and hand over more surplus value to their employers, thus intensifying the problem of unemployment.

Sir John Gorst is also another farsighted member of the capitalist class. He advocates the provision of free meals to some starving children because "England and Germany have a friendly rivalry in trade and manufactures, and how can we expect to carry on that rivalry with success unless very speedily such a social reform is carried out in this country as would put us on something like a footing with Germany?"

There are none so blind as those who cannot see, except those who will not.

In spite of all the efforts and self-sacrifice on the part of many men and women during the past 150 years, the position of trade unions to-day is by no means an enviable one. They are constantly being called upon to maintain conditions of labour which our forefathers obtained, and the fight grows more difficult every year.—*Charity Organisation Review*.

The terrific slaughter wrought in every country by consumption is—at least in the main—the inevitable result of the exploitation of helpless human lives for money profit, the inevitable result of over-work, lack of nutrition, and over-crowding. Talk of "alcoholism." The drinking bar is largely the refuge from the depressing, debasing surroundings of the so-called home.—*Daily News Paris Correspondent*.

Official figures show that 877,057 persons were employed in the mines of the United Kingdom last year, and that 698,967 of this total worked underground. Out of 9,544 children under fourteen years of age employed 6,818 worked underground. The fatal accidents numbered 1,158, involving a loss of 1,202 lives. Compared with the previous year this was an increase of 7 in fatal accidents, and of 10 in the number of lives lost.

Extracts from a series of articles from the pen of Mr. Collis Lovely on the subject of prison made American shoes, are published in *American Shoemaking*. Mr. Lovely's remarks are said to be based on personal observation made in different American prisons, while acting as special agent to investigate the operation of penal institutions under the Department of Labour of the State of Missouri. The investigations were made following his appointment, on March 2nd, 1905.

Mr. Lovely found 1,253 convicts were employed in shoemaking, at an average wage of 18 cents a day, turning out approximately 8,000,000 pairs of shoes annually, or probably about one-thirtieth of the entire annual production of the factory-made shoes of the United States. Of course, the prison output is disguised, the goods going upon the market as regular lines.

Kentucky branch penitentiary, at Eddyville, supplies the Kentucky Shoe Manufacturing Co. with 175 men at 15 cents per day, and the Frankfort Shoe Co. with 400 men at 50 cents a day, in addition to shop room, water, and light, free of charge. In connection with the Maryland penitentiary, Baltimore, the state supplies the Baltimore Boot and Shoe Manufacturing Co. with 225 men at 45 cents a day, with free shop room, light, water, and power. One of the most impressive examples of the extent that prison labour may be employed by a single firm in the manufacture of boots is, says Mr. Lovely, that of the Davis Boot and Shoe Co., Boston, who make their shoes under a prison contract with the Virginia penitentiary at Richmond, Va. The company employs 961 male convicts at 42 cents per day, and 56 female convicts at 30 cents a day, or a total of 1,017 persons, of which 16 are employed in making shoe boxes. The company's average output is said to be 5,000 pairs per day, or an average of five pairs per day, per person. Mr. Lovely adds, "I know of no firm employing free labour and making this grade of shoe, whose output exceeds five per day per person employed, and surely none who get their labour at 12 cents a day." This firm uses no machinery in the lasting department, and the task ranges from 36, 42, and 48 pairs per day, or an average of 42 pairs per day, lasted by hand. The task for McKay sewers is 480 pairs per day, edge trimmers 480 pairs per day, and so on all along the line. The above figures will reveal the fact that the total labour cost, exclusive of foremen, to the Davis Shoe Co., is 8 cents and a fraction per pair."

The Giesecke Boot and Shoe Manufacturing Co., of Jefferson City, made a contract in December, 1898, with the Missouri State penitentiary, at Jefferson City, for the convicts of that institution to be employed in the manufacture of footwear. This contract put thousands of dollars in the coffers of the company. The State, now, however, exacts 60 instead of 50 cents per day. Not only has this firm been furnished with shoe machine operators for 50 cents a day, but it has had free water, has paid absolutely nothing for rent, has been furnished with power from a 145-horse power engine, which would cost a manufacturer outside of a prison at least 500 dollars a month on payment to the State of only 100 dollars a month. In Missouri the task of a convict is based upon and usually equal to what a free labourer can perform. The penalty for a convict who fails to perform the task set for him is the whipping-post. From ten to thirty-nine lashes are usually given, and the strap used is made of heavy harness leather, 2in. wide and 18in. long, fastened to a wooden handle 12in. long. The strap will bring out the blood with every blow if the warder so desires.

There is no doubt that America is the "land of the free," and if such atrocities were perpetrated on the Congo or on the Rand, wouldn't the Nonconformist conscience shriek?

J. KAY.

Members and others are requested to address all communications to The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

The open-air lecture list is suspended. Meetings will be held by the branches at the usual places when weather permits. Indoor lectures will be delivered every Sunday evening at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, and at Dovecote Hall, Wood Green.

Back numbers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be had through any Branch Secretary.

DOUBTS AND DIFFICULTIES.

TYRANNY UNDER SOCIALISM.

I am certain, Comrade Editor, that "Cussedness" reigns universal in the human heart. No sooner have I got rid of one difficulty than I stand confronted with another. I answer a question in a manner at once brief, complete, and lucid and lo! a fresh questioner comes smilingly forward with "Yes, that is all right but arising from that answer how?" Yea, verily, the answering the doubts and difficulties of men is indeed a veritable labour of sisyphus!

The foregoing remarks are torn from my agonised soul by the following letter which I have just now received—Dear Economics, in your monthly grunt against things that are I see that you write against authority as exercised by experts. Apart from the fact that our ultimate appeal must ever be to the expert, and that the worker displays as much class bias as does the capitalist, is it not the case that any Socialist society must be more strongly under the control of authority—whether of the demagogue or of the pedagogue—that the rights of the minority will be denied them, and that, in a word, Socialism will be a gigantic slavery.

My correspondent in a short space covers a very wide field. The principles of scientific evidence; the psychology of class bias; the rights of the minority; and the organisation existing within a Socialist community: these are the matters that engage his attention.

My correspondent who, by-the-bye, signs himself "Anti-Rant," must bear with me if I dwell but lightly upon the three foremost of those topics in order that I may examine into the validity of his last statement. Last month I stated my opinion that the authority of the expert was a fallible one and that our ultimate appeal must be to the collective experience of mankind, whether this experience is found in written records, in personal experience, or in those ideas—commonly termed innate—which are the transmitted experience of his progenitors. From this opinion I can see no present reason to depart.

We shall endeavour with the courtesy of the Editor to deal with the question of class-bias on a future occasion and the question of the rights of minorities is bound up in no small degree with the subject of tyranny.

This charge of tyranny has often been levelled against the Socialist. Germinating in the mind of some worthy member of The Liberty and Property Defence League it has found an echo in the arguments of those always ready to give utterance to such cries. When we say that property is in its very essence a means of oppression, that it can only continue to exist in its present capitalistic form by virtue of its power of forcing men to work through the hunger of themselves, their wives, and their children, we meet with the retort that under Socialism tyranny will be yet more rampant and that man will then have every detail of his life arranged for him by the State.

To us this appears as a complete misunderstanding of the most rudimentary principles of Socialism. It is based upon the idea that the transformation of Society from Capitalism to Socialism is to be catalytic, instantaneous, and complete. On the contrary we Socialists contend that Socialism must pass through various phases before it reaches the final stage idealised by the Socialist. No matter how sudden may be the downfall of capitalism it will take some little time for Society to be new-built with beautiful homes and beautiful lives for all mankind.

Another misconception is the idea that Society under Socialism is to be governed by a bureaucratic State. This idea while quite unwarranted is in some measure justified by the attempts of the Fabian Society, the I.L.P., and other kindred bodies to foist upon the people of these islands a local bureaucratic collectivism.

The main fact to be remembered in this connection is that society under Socialism is the entire community, and that while it is true that the community as a whole will not come and see that you have your house built in the orthodox way, yet the community as a whole will be the ultimate arbiter in all things relating to the welfare of its members.

In a society based upon common ownership and control of the means requisite for producing and distributing the things necessary for human consumption, and where all things being thus held in common there are no distinctions of social position, it would be expected of everyone capable of working that he should take his fair share in the work of producing the common wealth. Should any refuse to perform this necessary work the community would have its own method—probably of denying them the right to consume the wealth produced by others—of bringing such recalcitrant persons to book.

Outside this requirement by the community that no person should be allowed to idly enjoy the fruits of the labours of others it is unlikely that there would be any interference with the lives of men. The self-regarding actions of men would be greatly extended by minimising the amount of work necessary for the securing a subsistence.

John Stuart Mill said "The principle is that the sole end for which mankind are warranted,

individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-protection: that the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community against his will is to prevent harm to others."

Under Socialism this principle will be properly observed, whereas to-day mankind is divided into two classes, one of which rules the other—the smaller capitalist class which monopolises all the advantages of our civilisation, constitutes Society, the State. By its owning the country it is enabled to enslave the other class—the working class—and to tyrannise over them. Tyranny is the necessary outcome of unequal possessions and can cease only on the cessation of privately owned wealth.

Socially owned wealth means a society of equals, of men possessing equal rights. Under such a society there will be no place for tyranny. As to-day social organisation will be the reflection of industrial organisation and the industrial organisation based upon equal wealth will be reflected by the organisation of society based upon equal social power. Under such a system of Society—

"Tyrants will flee
Like a dream's wild imagery,"
and tyranny, after tarrying throughout the centuries of privately owned property will vanish from the world of the future before the incoming Socialism as rapidly as difficulties are removed by the flowing pen of—
ECONOMICS.

THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION.

DOES IT DESERVE THE SUPPORT OF THE WORKING-CLASS?

Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, now in the possession of the Battersea Branch of The Socialist Party of Great Britain, was crowded on August 31st, the occasion being a debate upon the question asked above, between Mr. W. H. Humphreys, an accredited lecturer of the S.D.F. and Comrade J. Fitzgerald, representing the Executive Committee of the S.P.G.B.

Mr. George Hicks, O.B.S., presided, and after explaining the object and conditions of the debate, called upon the opener.

Mr. HUMPHREYS said that it mattered little to him whether the workers joined the S.D.F., S.P.G.B., or I.L.P., as long as they joined some Socialist organisation. The members of the Battersea Branch S.P.G.B. had gone to S.D.F. meetings and by their bickerings had undone the good work of the S.D.F. He maintained that the S.D.F. deserved the support of the working-class, although he strongly favored the formation of a United Socialist Party. The S.D.F. had helped to raise the physical and mental conditions of the workers. He did not always agree with its tactics. Politics was a dirty game and left its marks on those who played it. Years ago, when he joined the Army, he had belonged to the Socialist League, and did not believe in political action. When he left the Army the Socialist League was dead, while the S.D.F. still lived. This fact converted him to political action. The S.D.F. had produced much valuable literature and altogether had done an enormous amount of educational work. By backing up palliatives the S.D.F. kept the flag of Socialism flying. Some reforms might throw things back, but other reforms were also the means of getting better conditions for the workers and of dispelling superstition. The feeding of the children and secular education would make for the social revolution, as they would physically improve the race and abolish superstition. If we took political action the electors demanded a certain attitude on all questions. He was an anti-vaccinist, because he objected to having his child poisoned. This was not Socialism, but a question of human well-being. He was an Internationalist and therefore considered that it was the business of Socialists to prevent the Capitalists setting the workers of the world against each other. He was glad of the cordial relations existing between the French and English fleets. It seemed to him that The Socialist Party of Great Britain was opposed to the feeding of the children only because some capitalists now advocated this

reform. The S.P.G.B. argued that feeding the children meant making better wage slaves of them. The S.D.F. on the other hand held that the children when fed became more physically and intellectually fit. The workers could not at the present time control the political machinery. In order to do that they would first have to abolish plural voting and obtain payment of members and of election expenses. The second ballot would also be of advantage to the Socialists, as in three-cornered fights many would not risk their votes by voting for Socialist candidates as they would much rather back the winner. When the lecturers of the S.P.G.B. alleged that the workers were bought and sold like pieces of merchandise it amounted to backing up the bourgeois political economists. According to Karl Marx the workers only sold their labour-power. He held that material interests did not control all actions, as was easily proved by the action of the Japanese at Port Arthur, the Communards of Paris, and the Socialists who, owing to their revolutionary propaganda, were sent to Siberia. Principles very often controlled man's actions. Mr. H. M. Hyndman rightly denied that the workers could emancipate themselves, they must be taught and guided by such middle-class men as Marx, Engels, Hyndman and William Morris. They must not place too much reliance in working-class labour representatives. Battersea would have done much better if it had one such middle-class man as its Parliamentary representative instead of John Burns.

Comrade FITZGERALD pointed out that the subject of debate was "Did the S.D.F. deserve the support of the Working-class?" It must be clear that an organisation to deserve the support of the working-class must strenuously work on behalf of that class, and that class alone. The declared object of the S.D.F. was the emancipation of the working-class from the thraldom of capitalism, but in their political action they were going contrary to their principles. If it were true that under capitalism the workers had to sell themselves, their emancipation could surely only lie in becoming free men who could establish and control their own conditions of labour. To do that they must first capture the present political machinery, which was the means of entrenching the capitalist class so firmly in their citadel of economic domination. He would like Mr. Humphreys to explain how a man could sell his labour-power without selling himself. Man was therefore a commodity,

and differed from other commodities only in one respect. In the case of other commodities you could separate the seller from the commodity, whilst the worker was inseparable from his labour-power. And as the worker was bought by the capitalist to produce a profit, he must be robbed. The most important thing in life was to obtain the means of living, and this material fact must of necessity be the dominant factor in human movements. If that were so then the interests of capitalist and labourer must be irreconcilably opposed to one another. And if in order to become economically free the workers must get hold of and control the political machinery, then it stood to reason that any assistance given to the capitalists or their henchmen was decidedly taking antagonistic action to working-class interests. In 1894, Mr. H. M. Hyndman said that Socialists must not bend their knees to any capitalist party. In 1897, when there was a slump in the Socialist Movement, the S.D.F. at their Conference resolved that no candidates should be run unless there was proof of their command of at least 10% of the votes. In 1898 their Annual Conference empowered the E.C. to decide the policy of the organisation, subject to ratification by the branches. In 1899 the Conference decided that the members of the S.D.F. vote Tory, in order to smash the Liberal Party. In 1900, when the Boer War was on, they considered that they could not very well support the Tories; so they passed a resolution to support several Liberal candidates, viz., Labouchere at Northampton, Philip Stanhope at Burnley (Hyndman's candidature being withdrawn), Lionel Holland at Ilford, and John Burns at Battersea—a member of the E.C. of the S.D.F. working for Burns on his election day. In 1897 the S.D.F. ran W. G. Pearson for the London School Board and he polled 12,000 votes. After the death of Pearson they again contested the seat, with George Hewitt as the candidate, in 1900. The largest branch in the district, Bow and Bromley, fell out and so disrupted two other branches, viz., Whitechapel and Poplar, that they also fell out and subsequently collapsed. The Mile End Branch alone was left to carry on the campaign. All that disloyalty and disruption were due to the fact that Hewitt stood for Secular Education, which, G. Lansbury and his followers complained, would lose Lansbury the Nonconformist support for his Parliamentary candidature for Bow and Bromley. Mr. Cluse, an S.D.F. lecturer, stated that supporting capitalist candidates was not supporting the capitalist party, as the issue in 1900 was the Boer War. But he (Fitzgerald) would like to point out that this excuse could not hold water as the total casualties in the Boer War were less than 60,000, while the official returns for one year in four trades in the United Kingdom showed over 100,000 victims. Moreover, after the War was over, J. Hunter Watts supported Masterman, the Liberal candidate at Dulwich, and Will Thorne supported Percy Alden at Tottenham against the wish of the local Branch of the S.D.F. This labour leader also signed the Free Trade Manifesto of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress. If Socialists held that the cleavage between Capital and Labour was growing wider and that the workers could only obtain their emancipation by means of capturing the political machinery it was worse than madness to support capitalists or their nominees. The rank and file of the S.D.F. could obtain no information as to the doings of the E.C., as that body claimed that the members ought to have confidence in the elected men and trust them implicitly. Because some members of the S.D.F. had kicked against the Kautsky Resolution at the Paris International Congress they were accused of having inspired the letters that appeared in the *New York People* on that subject. When at the S.D.F. Conference at Blackburn, H. W. Lee and H. Quelch were accused of withholding from the Organisation a certain letter Lansbury had addressed to the E.C., both denied having done so. When, later, the letter was published and could no longer be denied as in existence, Quelch stated that he was not present when it was read although the E.C. minutes stated he was present at the meeting where the letter was read, and if he came in late, it was absurd to suppose that so important a letter was not shown to him. At Shoreditch, H. W. Lee admitted having told a lie and in

justification said that under similar circumstances he would do so again. Lansbury's letter had announced his resignation as S.D.F. Parliamentary candidate for Bow and Bromley because he could see no good coming of it unless the S.D.F. made common cause with the Liberals. When Socialists fight straight their political game is clean, when they back up Liberal hacks it becomes a dirty game. It was on account of their not fighting straight that a great number of members, some of the oldest members among them, came out of the S.D.F. and formed the S.P.G.B. The facts mentioned showed clearly that the S.D.F. was neither Socialist nor Democratic and therefore did not deserve the confidence of the working-class.

Mr. HUMPHREYS in continuing the debate again asserted that the capitalist did not buy the worker but only his labour-power. If he bought the worker he would look after him, as, however, he did not purchase him he let him go to the devil. In spite of the bad conditions of the workers, they could revolt against brutality. The desire to do good induced Hyndman, William Morris and others to fight for the working-class. It does not matter what class men are born in but what class they fight for. Henderson, Bell, and similar men were as bad as Liberal Capitalist candidates. It was an important matter to obtain better conditions for the workers as for instance free feeding of the children and secular education. Mr. Strauss, the late Liberal candidate for Mile End declared himself in favour of Socialism. Socialists accepting the co-operation of capitalists in obtaining reforms must make sure that these capitalists were earnest in helping forward those palliatives and there were some who were earnest. One must judge candidates on personal grounds. If the Tory candidate in Battersea declared in favour of feeding the children he would support him against Burns. Mr. Hunter Watts supported Masterman because Ruthford Harris had the blood of the South African farmers on his hands and it was not a question of mere numbers of victims; but Hunter Watts was wrong in supporting the Liberal candidate because that candidate was not in favour of the S.D.F. palliatives. That was a great mistake. All parties make mistakes. It was not in the material interests of the working-class in 1897 to have displayed their great loyalty to the Royal family. He had looked up Hansard and had found that in 1900 eight Radical members had voted against supplies for the Boer war. If they supported these men individually they did not support the Capitalist Party. It was true that a member of the E.C. of the S.D.F. supported and worked for Burns during the election in 1900. This was, however, done in conjunction and with somebody, who is now a member of the S.P.G.B. Will Thorne was called over the coals by the E.C. for supporting Percy Alden. If the rank and file of the S.D.F. did not get to know anything of the doings of their E.C. it was due to the fact that their organisation was poor and their full E.C. met only once a quarter. Their organisation had no money to waste and therefore were wise in deciding to run candidates only when they were sure of 10 per cent. of the vote in a constituency. Their expenses were heavy as it was. Golden sovereigns were hard to get. It was better to spend money on literature than on hopeless candidatures.

Comrade FITZGERALD in replying said that he had taken 25 minutes to bring the facts, points and arguments to show that the S.D.F. was acting against the interests of the working-class, but Mr. Humphreys had made no attempt at refuting his statements. The capitalist buys the worker's labour power bit by bit, hence had to buy his body. Under chattel slavery he bought the slave right out, but to-day he only bought the wage slave piecemeal, and owing to the number seeking sale was able to disregard their welfare. If some of the capitalist class act contrary to the interests of that class that does not prove that that class fights for the interests of the working-class. Mr. Hyndman had said that no slave class had brought about its own emancipation—the class above it had emancipated it. Therefore the middle-class would emancipate the working-class. Those who voted for individual capitalist candidates supported the capitalist party in the most effective manner, viz., politically. Capitalists were all

in one camp, and must be the enemies of the working-class, if Socialist principles were true. Mr. Hunter Watts' defence for voting for Masterman was absurd. If Ruthford Harris had the blood of the South African farmers on his hands, Masterman, as a Liberal, had the blood of the murdered Featherstone miners on his, which was worse. Two and two were four, even if the accountant made a mistake in adding up. Apparently the S.D.F. did not mean to learn by all their blunders and mistakes of the past. H. W. Lee, their Secretary, said in the current number of the *Social Democrat* that twenty years ago the Radical advocated payment of Members of Parliament, now the S.D.F. must do that work. The E.C. of the S.D.F. not only make mistakes but deceived the workers in regard to their tactics, which were not Socialist but Radical. At the last Annual Conference of the S.D.F. at Northampton, Mr. Dan Irving threatened to leave the Conference if his motion were not carried. When L. Cotton, at the Shoreditch Conference, insisted that his vote had been falsified, Mr. Irving refused to go into the matter. Mr. J. P. Lloyd had moved that some scheme should be devised to let the members know more of the work of the E.C. Members of the S.D.F. were kept in ignorance of things, and when information came to them and they revolted they were at once branded as impossible. He (Fitzgerald) was described as a danger. At Burnley when he called for evidence, Quelch declared he had none. The S.D.F. having broken its pledges by backing up the capitalist position, directly and indirectly, did certainly not deserve the support of the working-class.

H. N.

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN BULGARIA.

[The following facts are extracted from a long letter, written in Esperanto, which has been received from Comrade P. Petrov, of Tarnobol, and should be interesting in view of recent developments in this country.]

Industrially, Bulgaria is where Britain was 100 years ago, but slowly, nevertheless most certainly, capitalism penetrates and will continue to penetrate into the land. After the country's liberation from Turkish rule it commenced to shape like the Western European states; its government, its army, its political and economic life commenced to take an entirely new form and direction. European news, and news of European Socialism were spread throughout the land. But because production was still in the hands of the small middle-class, because the ordinary labourer did not exist as in England, the labour movement was entirely weak, and in no way Socialistic.

From 1894 there has existed a Social Democratic Party, but at the commencement the members were principally of the middle-class. The majority of the party consisted of merchants and small proprietors. During the years 1898 to 1901 there was an economic crisis, which greatly affected the merchants, small proprietors and agriculturists, who then began to doubt the capability of the different bourgeois parties, who were politically dominant, and to look with a favorable eye to the Socialists, thinking that they (the Socialists) might improve their adversely affected condition. At that time the Socialists were exceedingly active amongst the people, but in their propaganda paid more attention to the minimum program of the Social Democratic Party than to the maximum, and they succeeded in sending 7 deputies to Parliament. But the success was not lasting. In the following years the crop was exceedingly good and the economic position improved. Discontent subsided and the majority of the middle-class members left the ranks of the party. Then some of the Socialists began to advocate a middle course. They doubted whether capitalism would spread over Bulgaria, and, desiring immediate success, they, little by little, fell away from Socialist principles and advocated strenuously, "One common cause amongst the producing corporations." Then commenced a battle amongst the Socialists themselves. Some desired to remain true to the party principles, especially on the

question of the Class War. Others wished to make "Labour Compromises," and in March, 1905 the party divided into two sections, one wishing to work specially amongst the laborers, whilst not ignoring the lower middle-class, who were being gradually forced into the ranks of the laborers, and always holding to the class war, and the other dreaming about the common cause between the producing corporations, and advocating compromises. To the first came all true and conscious Socialists, to the other a few workmen, sincere, but led astray. And thus were formed two Socialist sections, acting as independent parties. But it was soon remarked that the second section was acting as an enemy of the Labour Movement and of Socialism! Because the first section worked amongst a smaller circle and severely held to the principles of scientific Socialism, they were named "narrow Socialists" ("impossibilists"), and the others were named "broad Socialists," or "common-causers" "opportunists."

The "narrowers," assured of the economic development in the future, knowing that capitalism was spreading and would continue to spread, commenced a quiet but continuous and fruitful policy of educating the workers in their class interests. Many workmen's societies, enlightened and instructed, and syndicates (trade unions) soon sprang up, in which a strong propaganda was conducted, aiming at the creation of sound, conscious and capable fighters, worthy to be enrolled under the Red Flag, and shoulder to shoulder, to defend their class, and together with the proletariat of the whole world, to organise for the establishment of the Socialist Republic. In a short time the members of the party, and of the separate societies, greatly increased.

Meanwhile, the enemies of the workers, the "broad" Socialists, preached and still preach to the workers organised in trade unions "neutrality," i.e., no political action by the unions. They wish the unions to see nothing but their direct trade interests, to fight only on the economic field. The "narrow" Socialists, on the other hand, preach that the workers must also fight the capitalists politically, and of course must come to the Socialist party, which alone in Bulgaria defends the class interests of the workers. They say, always and everywhere, that the economic and political battles are the two foundations of the class war.

The "broad" "ex-Socialists" as the "narrow" ones term them, pursue a policy which is entirely contrary to the principles handed down to us by our great first instructors, Marx and Engels. They are like the Bernsteinians in Germany, the Jauresists in France (previous to their union with the Guesdists) and the Turatists in Italy. A few trade unions are under their influence, but their number ever declines. They cannot even conduct a strike!

The "narrowers" have a good Socialist literature. Their chief organ, "Workers' Gazette," appears twice weekly, and is also the official organ of the trade unions. The "New Time" is a monthly review, and there are many others. The "broadones" also issue a journal twice weekly—"The Workers' Battle." They also issued a review—"The Common Cause," but this has ceased. They make full use of the literature and translations of the "narrowers."

In Tambol, whence our comrade writes and where he lives, there is a Workers' Instruction Society, which aims at preparing members for the party. They thoroughly study Socialism, and when by their action and consciousness they prove that they understand it, and not till then, they are admitted to the ranks of the active Socialists.

The Party Congress took place in August, and amongst other things it was decided that in future no one should have the right to issue any gazette or review, unless the Party gave permission. The question of the unity of the Bulgarian Socialists, arising out of the Amsterdam resolution, occupied attention, but it was decided that as the "broad" Socialists are not really Socialists, that instead of helping the coming of scientific Socialism, they hindered it, no union could take place, but every true friend of Socialism was called upon to enrol under the red flag of the genuine Socialist Party, those who would be termed in Britain, the "impossibilists."

S.P.G.B.

North London District Council.

LECTURES FOR OCTOBER.

DOVECOTE HALL, :—
78, High Road, Wood Green, at 7.30.

October 1st.—C. LEHANE. "The Socialist Commonwealth: What it Means."

October 8th.—R. ELRICK. "Why I am an 'Impossibilist.'"

October 15th.—A. ANDERSON. Subject to be announced.

October 22nd.—E. J. B. ALLEN. "Trade Unionism."

October 29th.—Debate. "Is the Marxian Theory of Value Correct?"

J. FITZGERALD (S.P.G.B.) affirmative.

W. A. WILSON (Cobden Club) negative.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 1.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN,

Containing, in full detail, a statement of the

Principles, Policy, & Rules OF THE PARTY.

Post free, 1 copy, 14d.; 6 copies, 5d.; 12 copies, 9d. Special terms for larger quantities. Orders and remittances should be forwarded to the Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT.

The Editorial Committee of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD have pleasure in announcing that in the

NEXT ISSUE

they hope to publish the first instalment of the translation, revised by the author, of the famous

ERFURTER PROGRAMME,

BY

KARL KAUTSKY.

VOL. I.

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Well bound in stiff boards,

Post Free ... 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be sent to Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

Branch Secretaries and others SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers, Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

1A, CALEDONIAN RD., KING'S CROSS, LONDON, N.
Acting General Secretary - A. ANDERSON.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—E. Philpot, Sec., 14, Coleridge Avenue, Manor Park, E. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 at above address.

EAST LONDON (Central).—A. Jacobs, Sec., 79, Moody Street, Mile End, E. Branch meets every Friday at the Secretary's address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 34, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 309, North End Road, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—C. Thorp, Sec., 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Tuesdays at 8.30 at the Co-op. Stores, 79, Grove Rd., Holloway.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 48, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. Debates alternate Tuesdays. All invited.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—J. W. Robertson, Secretary, 17, Etherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Sundays in month. Economic Class 2nd and 4th Sunday, at 3 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Park Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at Spiritualist Hall, 32, Dames Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Comrades desiring to acquire or sell books on Social Science, etc. (new or second-hand), should send particulars to the Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N., from whom the undermentioned unsoiled works may be obtained at prices stated.

CAPITAL.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION.

By KARL MARX.

(Published at 10/6)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES.

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LABOUR.

By PROF. J. E. THOROLD ROGERS.

(New Edition, Revised, Published at 10/6)

Carriage Free ... 5s. 6d.

POVERTY.

A STUDY OF TOWN LIFE.

By B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.

(Illustrated by Folding Maps, Diagrams, &c.) (Published at 10/6)

Carriage Free ... 4s. 6d.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 15. Vol. 2.]

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE
SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT
BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Readers who can endorse the foregoing in its entirety are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the nearest Branch or with the General Secretary. See Directory, page 8.

IS THE MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY SUFFICIENT?

INTERESTING LETTERS ON AN INTERESTING SUBJECT.

[The following correspondence has passed between two members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. The subject matter is of such importance—an understanding of what is implied by the term “the materialist conception of history” being indispensable to anything like an adequate appreciation of the Socialist position—and our comrade Watts has presented his case so admirably, that we have readily undertaken to give the letters the wider publicity of these columns.—ED. CTTEE.]

Dear Comrade, So far as I understand it, I agree with the Materialist Conception of History, but recently I have been studying the reports of the Sociological Society, which magnify the problem of the unification of the Social sciences until it appears almost insoluble; and I have had my faith shaken in the sufficiency of the Materialist Conception because these learned people have made the question appear so great that the Materialist Conception appears too simple. I will, therefore, explain the difficulty according to the disciples of the Sociological Society.

They appear to agree that society is an organism of a complicated type, and that these complications are made intelligible only through their relations being truly comprehended. They view the sociological field as at present being separated into many particular fields, each in the hands of specialist investigators, and they claim that the sociologist (through the Sociological Society) is the scientist whose duty it is to co-ordinate the social specialisms and generalise from the investigations of the social sciences. They consider that the specialist investigators should work with the idea of the ultimate unity of their investigations, an idea that they claim it is one of the duties of the Sociological Society to foster. They deprecate the interpretation of the highly complex social phenomena in the terms of any one specialism; and this, it seems to me, is the point that particularly touches us.

On every hand we see men working with a view to the application of their particular remedy for various social evils. Do we not come under the same ban? Do we not offer a sort of Morrison's Pill for the earthquake? Socialism, at the last and ultimate analysis, is an economic proposition, a fundamental one, I grant; but still purely economic. Now the economic relations of men in society are not the only ones. We say: true, but all other relations grow out of the economic ones, and this, as I understand it, is the basis of the Materialist Conception of History. The point, then, is to demonstrate that the all important, the dominating factor in society is its economic conditions.

There are a considerable number of people sometimes designated cranks, who desire to regenerate society through the application of their particular Morrison's Pill. According to your alleged philosophic radical, all that is required is political perfection—the carrying of certain political-revolutionary reforms (I use the

Hibernianism advisedly). According to the temperance fanatic, all that is required is the entire removal of the “drink evil,” root and branch. The ethical reformer seeks to emphasise the moral factor in social relations and through that means to establish the millennium. The orthodox man seeks that everybody should believe that certain impossible things once happened, and through that belief, somehow, I know not how, the millennium is coming. And so on. Every reformer of whatever colour or creed, has some Morrison's Pill to give Society, to cure it of all its evils at one blow. But again I ask, does not the Socialist fall into the same category? He says that ethical, moral, religious; artistic, æsthetic; political and intellectual relations are fundamentally determined by the economic relations, and he seeks to alter those economic relations so that following from such revolutionary change should come the change (and, of course, improvement) in the ethical, moral, religious; artistic, æsthetic; political, intellectual, and all other relations.

Now the difficulty seems to be, even granting all that we claim for the dominance of economic conditions, how far can man's intellect get ahead of his economic and other conditions, and frame ideas and ideals to work to and for? If man's ideas were rigidly determined by his economic environment, the Socialist would be impossible, and indeed, the social conservative would be impossible, too, because in the same environment we find most divergent minds.

The whole problem that I am trying to formulate would seem to be the old one of “free-will” and “determinism.” And the only explanation of the divergences can be the individual temperament, call it what you will. So that the position seems to resolve itself into the effects of the action of the environment in which must be included every influence which the human mind comes into contact with from first to last on the individual personality, the “ego.” The great difficulty would seem to be, therefore, the true recognition of the forces that go to make up that ego through hereditary channels. Is our knowledge of the action of heredity sufficient for the formulation of a philosophy that should comprehend all the influence that go to make men, in all their strange variations of temperament?

In conclusion, therefore, I would ask, is the Materialist Conception sufficient for the explanation of all the complex phenomena of modern Society?

Fraternally yours,
“ENGINEER.”

P.S. Of course, you must not suppose that I am such a heretic on the Socialist philosophy as I appear from the above. I have exaggerated my own difficulties in order, not only to make the matter more controversial, but to, so far as possible, get the other side discussed.

Dear Comrade, I have read your letter on the

Materialist Conception of History, and as I hold firmly to that conception as a guiding principle (having entirely convinced myself of its truth), I shall be glad to discuss the matter.

Before doing so, however, I will ask you to carefully peruse the following somewhat lengthy but exceedingly important quotation from Marx's "Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," which gives an explanation of the Materialist Conception of History, as it is necessary to define our terms before using them as signs in our discussion.

This extract is from the preface to Marx's "Critique of Political Economy." Published (in Germany) 1857.

"The first work which I undertook for the purpose of solving the doubts which perplexed me was a critical re-examination of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Law.' The introduction to this work appeared in the German French Year Books of 1844. My investigations ended in the conviction that legal relations and forms of government cannot be explained either by themselves or by the so-called development of the human mind, but, on the contrary, have their roots in the conditions of men's existence, whose totality Hegel, following the French and English writers of the eighteenth century, summed up under the name of civil society; and that the anatomy of civil society must be sought in political economy, to which study I next gave my attention.

"The general result at which I arrived and which, once obtained, served as a guide for my subsequent studies, can be briefly formulated as follows:

"In making their livelihood together men enter into certain necessary, involuntary relations with each other.

"These industrial relations arise out of their respective conditions and occupations and correspond to whatever stage society has reached in the development of its material productive forces. Different stages of industry produce different relations.

"The totality of these industrial relations constitutes the economic structure and basis of society.

"Upon this basis the legal and political superstructure is built.

"There are certain forms of social consciousness or so-called public opinion which correspond to this basis.

"The method prevailing in any society of producing the material livelihood determines the social, political and intellectual life of men in general.

"It is not primarily men's consciousness which determines their mode of life; on the contrary it is their social life which determines their consciousness.

"When the material productive forces of society have advanced to a certain stage of their development they come into opposition with the old conditions of production, or, to use a legal expression, with the old property relations under which these forces have hitherto been exerted.

"Instead of serving longer as institutions for the development of the productive powers of society, these antiquated property relations now become hindrances. Then begins an epoch of social revolution.

"With the change of the economic basis the whole vast superstructure undergoes, sooner or later, a revolution.

"In considering such revolutions we must always distinguish clearly between the change in the industrial methods of social production on the one hand; this change takes place unconsciously, strictly according to the laws of natural science, and might properly be called an evolution.

"And, on the other hand, the change in the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophical, in short, ideological, institutions; with reference to these men fight out this battle as a revolution conscious of their opposing interests. This conflict takes the form of a class struggle.

"As little as we judge an individual by what he thinks he is, just as little can we judge such revolutionary epoch by its own consciousness.

"We must rather explain this consciousness out of the antagonisms of men's industrial occupations, out of the conflict existing between the productive capacity of social industry and the legal institutions under which this industry is carried on.

"A society, no matter what its form may be, is never broken up until all the productive powers are developed for which it is adapted.

"New and higher social institutions are never established until the material conditions of life to support them have been prepared in the lap of the old society itself. Therefore, mankind never sets for itself any tasks, except those for which it has received proper training and which it is able to perform.

"If we examine closely, it will always be found that the conflict never arises except where the material conditions of its solution are already at hand, or at least are in the process of growth.

"We may in wide outlines characterise the Asiatic, the antique, the feudal and the modern capitalistic methods of production as a series of progressive epochs in the evolution of economic society.

"The industrial relations arising out of the capitalistic method of production constitute the last of the antagonistic forms of social production; antagonistic not in the sense of antagonism between individuals, but of antagonism growing out of the circumstances in which men must live who take part in social production.

"But the productive forces which are developed in the lap of capitalistic society create at the same time the material conditions needed for the abolition of this antagonism. The capitalist form of society, therefore, will bring to a close this cycle of the history of human society, as it has existed under the various forms of exploitation."

And now to proceed with my own contribution to the discussion.

All history, indeed all intellectual life, can be explained only from the accompanying and preceding material conditions, since any other theory than this postulates an uncaused thing, which is contrary to all experience, and is therefore unscientific and untenable. Intellectual life is but the reflex of material conditions. That intellectual life has a secondary reflex action upon material conditions in no way changes the fact that material conditions form the base, origin, and material of all intellectual life.

Now, in the Materialist Conception of History we are given the dominant factor in the determination of all history; that is, the method in which wealth is produced and exchanged. Obviously, in order that there may be human history two things are essential; firstly, men, and secondly, food and shelter for them. How much, where and how food and shelter can be obtained, determines, firstly, man's existence, secondly, where he shall live, and thirdly, how he shall live. Therefore the Materialist Conception of History is without doubt the determining and basic factor in all history; indeed, broadly interpreted, all material conditions are comprised in it.

Just as we speak of the "Law of Evolution" so we may speak of the Materialist Conception as the "Law of History." As in one case we can explain existing organic forms by the "Law of Evolution," so in the other case we can explain existing social forms only by the materialist "Law of History." In organic, as in social, evolution, there are many minor matters that, with our present defective knowledge we cannot yet explain. Nevertheless, it would be absurd and unscientific to abandon the law which has been proved right in so many instances the moment we come upon obscure or complicated detail whose connection with the fundamental law is not at once seen.

Both in biology and in sociology, inability to see the working of fundamental principles or laws is usually the result of insufficient knowledge, narrowness of the field of view, and *a priori* notions. This is especially true of the modern social specialist. Lost in a forest of detail he lacks the breadth of view that is necessary to an understanding of general principles. We do not now magnify the accidentals of zoology to the extent that the old naturalists did, who thereby got fanciful and conflicting classifications; but, probably aided by the fact that we see the detail of animal life from a distance, and so get a truer perspective than in sociology, we have grasped the basic principles of organic evolution in the food supply and the conditions of the struggle to obtain it. No science is so subjective as sociology, for here we meet the "furies of private interests," and hampered

as are the majority of specialists by preconceived ideas and class prejudice, small wonder is there that even the most honest of them arrive at such insane conclusions. They fail to distinguish between essentials and accidentals, and detail assumes greater importance than principles or laws in consequence. "They cannot see the wood for the trees." Specialisation is, of course, essential, but the co-ordination of the social sciences can only be the work of one who takes a thorough but even view of all.

To realise the full force of the Materialist Concept a broad knowledge of history, economics, and natural science is absolutely essential, and history is the most important. Such broad surveys of history as are given in even elementary primers like Jenk's *History of Politics* and Fyffe's *History of Greece*, or in such works as Thorold Rogers' *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* and Buckle's *Introduction to the History of Civilisation*, throw into relief the general principles of history and afford a granitic foundation to the Materialist Conception.

It is too great a task to attempt any historical survey here; but it is most clear, to take the example that immediately affects us, that the tremendous transformation in this country during the last three centuries of the conditions of things and the social life arising therefrom, is directly traceable to the wonderful change which has taken place in the methods of producing and distributing wealth. A new class has been created and forced to power. The face of the country has been changed from agricultural to manufacturing. Huge towns have arisen where once were cornfields. The change from individual to social production has revolutionised social relationships.

Where once men worked singly for home consumption they now work in huge armies for others, disciplined and commanded. Where once was handicraft is now giant machine production. All this has been brought about by the gradual change in the methods of producing and distributing the wealth of the country; due to the greater economy of co-operative over individual production, and to the greater economy of machine over hand labour. Modern social life is explicable only upon this basis: the line of least resistance in wealth production impelling men into entirely new social relationships.

It will be seen how curious is the idea that the scientific Socialist, by indicating economic conditions as the basis of all social relationships, has only a Morrison's Pill *a la* Carlyle to offer of no greater efficiency than is usual with such nostrums. The cure-all pill idea implies idealism. It implies that men can, out of their own souls, evolve a scheme of things and force it on society without that scheme being of necessity the outcome of present conditions and in harmony with the natural trend of things. Socialism of the scientific type is, of course, not this by any means. The various reformers with their nostrums are rather like the quacks who profess to cure virulent fevers by means of prayers, charms and incantations, or at least like the pseudo scientific quacks who prescribe drugs to counteract only the symptoms and effects of diseases, leaving the causes untouched. The Socialist is rather like the true scientist who goes to causes in material conditions, and sees that effective drainage is laid down, cleanliness maintained, and correct food given.

The question often occurs: how is it that in identical environment some are Socialists and some are conservatives, if economic conditions determine, in the last resort, the views of men? The matter of this "identical environment" can be illustrated by a simple analogy. Suppose a hundred soft clay balls were put in a bag and sat on, these balls would all be in an identical environment, like men in any class in society subjected to economic pressure, so what would happen? Some balls would be squared, some slightly flattened, and some utterly squashed, as determined by their position in this so-called identical environment. In society different classes have different environment. In a given class some would be slightly modified conservatives, and some revolutionary: as pressure increases so all would become entirely altered. All, then, would be affected, but slightly unequally, since no two balls, or two persons, could possibly be in exactly the same environment. So in society men picture the future from what they see and feel in the present. Some by

OUR VIEW OF THE RECENT MUNICIPAL "ENTENTE."

At the Quarterly Meeting of Delegates held on Saturday last at the Communist Club it was unanimously resolved to send the following telegram and letter to the National Congress of the French Socialist Party in Chalon:

TELEGRAM.

London, Oct. 28th, 1905.
To the President of National Socialist Congress, Chalon, France.

Fraternal greetings but we protest against action of Paul Brousse and other Municipal Councillors, members of your Party, last week in London.

(Signed) CARTER,
Secretary of The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

LETTER.

1a, Caledonian Road, London, W.C.
October 29th, 1905.

To the President of the
National Socialist Congress,
Chalon, France.

Dear Comrade,

We have the pleasure of confirming our telegram of yesterday which read: "Fraternal greetings, but we protest against action of Paul Brousse and other Municipal Councillors, members of your Party, last week in London."

While we note that your Party is based upon the class-struggle, we desire to point out that the recognition of the class-struggle alone is, however, not sufficient guarantee for uncompromising Socialist action in open hostility to all capitalist parties or alleged labour organisations supporting the capitalist class. We hold that Socialist principles must at all times be honestly translated into politics. Hence any alliance or co-operation with the enemies of Socialism can only tend to confuse the minds of the working-class and thus retard the achievement of their emancipation from wage-slavery. If the Socialist Party of each country are to seize the political machinery, national and municipal, they can do so only by carrying the class-struggle to its logical conclusion, that is, by acting throughout in antagonism to the class which, under the present system, control the political machinery, and by doing so are enabled to retain possession and control of the means of production and distribution.

We therefore protest strongly against representatives of your Party feasting and receiving or being feasted or received by the political representatives of the capitalist class. The fact of Paul Brousse and other members of your Party having been feasted and received by the municipal representatives of the capitalist class in this country has been a severe blow to the Socialist Cause, not only in Britain, but to the whole International Socialist movement. It appears to us that this municipal "Entente" between the capitalist administration of London and the so-called Socialist municipal administration of Paris is but a municipal endorsement of the "Entente" of two capitalist governments already established. And it further appears to us that the fact of Parisian Socialist Councillors having taken part in the interchange of capitalist municipal courtesies will be utilised by the Liberal Party (which controls the London County Council) to obtain the votes of the British working class at the approaching General Election.

Seeing that at your Congress you are to consider your political action we sincerely trust that you will take such steps as will prevent in future representatives of your Party coquetting with or paying homage to the representatives of capitalism in France or abroad.

In conclusion we wish to point out that by the expression of the foregoing sentiments we do not presume to interfere with your internal affairs but to convey to you our opinion as to the action pursued by members of your Party which seriously affects the propaganda of Socialism in this country.

With fraternal greetings, I remain, dear Comrade,

Yours in the Cause of
International Socialism,
(Signed) G. C. H. CARTER,
General Secretary,
The Socialist Party of Great Britain.

[A further instalment of this correspondence will appear in the next issue.]

PARTY NOTES.

It is particularly requested that all communications be addressed: "The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 1a, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N." See official notice on page 4.

Last quarter 51 new members were enrolled. This is very gratifying, and shows that just in proportion as we can place our views before the public we shall add to our membership. Now that the weather has compelled us to shut down our regular open-air propaganda, we cannot, of course, expect to increase at the same rate.

In connection with the formation of new branches, I would suggest that we should "make haste slowly." The strength of an organisation does not depend upon the number of "branches" it can show on paper, but upon the activity displayed by the members. Public propaganda and the sale of literature are the test.

Members will be pleased to learn of the success attending the issue of the first instalment of the S.P.G.B. Library. The Manifesto is still selling well. Those who have not yet read it can obtain a copy direct from the Head Office, post free, 1/6d. It explains the Principles and Policy of the S.P.G.B., and goes fully into our attitude towards the S.D.F., I.L.P., L.R.C., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, etc. It also contains the rules of the Party.

During the winter months the sales of our journal will probably decline somewhat, but our members will see to it, as before, that the Party funds do not suffer. Cheques and Money Orders should be made payable to A. J. M. Gray. As many as possible should become annual subscribers. For 1s. 6d. THE SOCIALIST STANDARD will be sent post free to any address in the world for twelve months.

It is suggested that Branches do their best during the indoor season to develop the latent ability they will undoubtedly find among their members by debates, lectures, classes, and other means. Too ambitious efforts are not to be encouraged at first, but a great deal of profit might be gained by discussions on the several sections of the "Declaration of Principles" and especially the "Manifesto" which contains a vast amount of condensed information.

The Sunday evening lectures will be continued during November at Sydney Hall, Battersea, and at Dovecot Hall, Wood Green, (see advertisements on pp. 3 and 8). Debates also take place on alternate Tuesday evenings at the S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. The opener on Tuesday next will be G. C. H. Carter.

The Head Office will be kept open every Saturday until 4 o'clock, for the convenience of members wishing to make payments or obtain literature, etc. G. C. H. CARTER, Gen. Sec.

REVISIONISM AND THE GERMAN SOCIALIST PARTY.

In the issue of "Vorwaerts," the Central Organ of the German Socialist Party, of October the 21st last, appeared an announcement that six members of the Editorial Staff of the "Vorwaerts" had tendered their resignation to the Executive Council of the Party. The issue of the same paper of October the 24th contained the following notice:

"To the Members of the Party.

"To-day a meeting was held in which took part the Executive Council of the Party, the Press Committee of the 'Vorwaerts,' the Confidential Men of Berlin and suburbs, the Chairmen and Treasurers of the 8 Socialist Election Associations, the Local Committee, the Propaganda Committee for the Province of Brandenburg and the Members of the Party for Parliament for the Constituencies in Berlin and suburbs. Those present resolved—only 8 dissenting: 'That this meeting accepts the resignation of Comrades Buttner, Eisner, Gradnauer, Kaliski, Schroder and Wetzker as Editors of the 'Vorwaerts,' as such resignation will make it possible to change the conditions in the Editorial Department of the paper in accordance with the wishes and views of this meeting. The Executive Council and Press Committee are hereby instructed to take the necessary steps for replacing some of the Editorial Staff accordingly. Public information as to the incidents leading to the resignation of the said 6 comrades will be given to the members of the Party as soon as matters have been put straight in the Editorial Department."

(Signed) The Executive Council."

For the information of those who are unable to follow up the progress of the movement in other countries it may here be explained that at the last annual Congress of the German Socialist Party the Editorial Staff of the "Vorwaerts" was requested to refrain from supporting Revisionism. The aforementioned six members of the Staff, among whom is Buttner the Editor-in-Chief, took no notice of the warning by the Congress or subsequently by the Executive Council. This body was consequently compelled to hold several meetings relating to this matter and to refuse the Staff of the "Vorwaerts" admittance thereto. This want of confidence was too much for the six above mentioned, hence their resignation. For the present there is no further news to hand. The full Editorial Staff of the "Vorwaerts" at present consists of 10 members, viz., Buttner (Chief and responsible Editor), Eisner and Gradnauer (Politics), Schroder and Kaliski (Local), Wetzker (Social), Strobel (Foreign), Cunow (Economics), John (Trade Unions), and Leid (Party News). H.N.

S. P. G. B. BATTERSEA BRANCH.

SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES

WILL BE GIVEN AT

SYDNEY HALL

36, YORK ROAD, BATTERSEA,

AS UNDER—

- Nov. 5th—T. A. JACKSON:
"The Philosophy of Socialism."
"12th—H. C. PHILLIPS:
"Capitalism up-to-date."
"19th—CON. LEHANE:
"The Poverty of the Clergy."
"26th—J. FITZGERALD:
"The Economic Trend."

Chair at 7.30 sharp. Discussion.
ADMISSION FREE.

ECONOMIC CLASSES

Will be held every alternate Sunday (commencing Nov. 5th), at Sydney Hall, 3 p.m.

Instructor—J. FITZGERALD.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is now situate at 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N., to which address ALL communications should be sent.

General correspondence should be addressed to "The General Secretary."

Articles and correspondence submitted for insertion in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be addressed to "The Editorial Committee."

Subscriptions and advertisements for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, and orders for pamphlets, book, &c., issued or sold by the Party, should be addressed to "The Publications Department."

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office on the first Saturday in each month, at 3 p.m., and on the third Tuesday in each month, at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

	£	s.	d.
Twelve Months	0	1	6

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per Inch, One Insertion	0	2	0
Quarter Column do.	0	5	6
Half Column do.	0	10	0
One Column do.	1	0	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard,



SATURDAY, NOV. 4, 1905.

THE FOLLY OF FOOLS.

Is common with most other London and Sub-urban districts. Poplar has an unemployed problem—somewhat more acute, perhaps, in the neighbourhood of Poplar, but the same problem that afflicts every industrial centre of every capitalist country in the world, and, because capitalism is impossible without this out-of-work army, that will continue to afflict until production is organised for the use of the producer as distinguished from the profit of the non-producer, as at present. But the affairs of Poplar, being in the hands of progressive gentlemen—practically Socialists as we are informed—it follows that, in real or feigned ignorance of the inevitability of unemployment, the public progressive persons of Poplar are making efforts to solve the, underpresent conditions, insolvable. Their methods as compared with those of other borough councillors are, however, sensational. They want, and in this respect they are just ordinary, Mr. Balfour to call a special Parliamentary session to deal with the question—although what that amiable apostle of culture could do is not clear. Mr. Balfour, apparently, is not inclined to do anything of the sort. Whereupon our Poplar worthies spring into a great notoriety by asking that the King himself shall hear their requisition, the which the "little father," being a moderately wide-awake gentleman, agrees to. The humble and loyal representations are duly made and most graciously received (the little mother smiling sympathetically the while) and—passed back to the amiable Balfour! Whereat Poplar is delighted, Mr. and Mrs. Crooks are photographed in the act of smiling their pleasure, the Mayor walks on his heels, bearing himself proudly, and the unemployed take in their belts another hole and look hopelessly and shudderingly ahead to the rigors of a winter that threatens to be even longer and more bitter than usual.

Well, it is useless to bemoan the abysmal

ignorance that will forever follow in the wake of folly. We can only proclaim to those whom our voices will reach and who have ears to hear, that there is no hope for the working-class until they cease appealing and appealing and appealing for what they may take when they will. We can only repeat and repeat and repeat that there is no hope for the working-class until they have understood and have themselves taken over the means by which they may produce the things necessary to their life and happiness. It may seem a cold and comfortless answer to give the appeal of huddled misery crying aloud for "something now." But it is not. It is a message charged with hope and a great possibility—if only the workers will listen. It is a message that will bring the "something now"—if only the workers will listen. For, as we have so often urged, and as every indication goes to show, "something now" is never conceded except out of the fear of the possessing class. And no greater fear can be bred in their hearts than that of an intelligent working-class after the means of life—upon the ownership of which the power of the capitalist depends. At present the workers are asking for crumbs as a charity, and they get the equivalent of nothing. Let them demand the whole loaf as a right and show behind their demand a determination that will not be denied and the "something now" will surely materialize. The message of the S.P.G.B. indicates the only path that can be followed for the attainment of the "something now" or the whole loaf of presently.

THE SILENCE OF JONES AND OTHERS.

Two months ago we challenged those (members of the S.D.F. and others) who had alleged inaccuracy, misrepresentation and abuse against us to produce their evidence. We offered every facility possible to enable them to establish their charge, undertaking to withdraw anything that had been written and that we found ourselves unable to justify, in a frank and honourable manner. We knew of nothing that would bear the construction of abuse or misrepresentation, but we were quite ready to believe that those who were concerned to prefer charges against us had some basis in fact for them, and were not entirely actuated by malice. As we said then, we are anxious to remain what we have always endeavoured to be, a clean and clear exponent of unadulterated and unadjectival Socialism, and should be grateful to anyone who would point out where we have failed and how we might remedy our defect.

Our challenge was reprinted in leaflet form, and scattered broadcast. It has been brought directly under the notice of many of our accusers, and—it has met with absolutely no response!

Very well. Let the working-class judge the motives of men who will make damaging allegations without being able to produce their proof and who will not avail themselves of the opportunity of withdrawing what they find themselves unable to substantiate. We ask the working-class of Camber Division to note the position of Councillor J. Jones in this connection. Cllr. Jones is one of the many S.D.F. men who have accused us of vilification and perverting the truth. But Cllr. Jones has supported his allegation with no proof, which is *prima facie* evidence of his inability to do so; nor has he withdrawn his allegations, which is *prima facie* evidence of the absence in him of a sufficiency of decency and honesty.

And that is all the comment we need make.

TOLSTOY—IMPOSSIBLIST!

As against those professing Socialists who endeavour to secure the kudos and advertisement attaching to the identification with their position of individuals who have, by divers methods, attained to prominence in the public eye, we are concerned that the message we bring to the working-class shall be assessed on its own merits. Just as we, knowing its harmfulness as well as its futility, are opposed to the endeavour to obtain support for Socialism by tactics of compromise and the propagation of something less than Socialism, so we are opposed to the endeavour to create for Socialism a standing of greater "respectability" by covering it with the glamour of great names—whether of monarchical courtesses or mystic counts. Hence the publication in another column of the letter from Tolstoy.

Tolstoy's disclaimer may come as an awkward pronouncement to those notoriety-mongers who, having claimed to be Socialists, have claimed Count Tolstoy for their supporter and widely advertised the connection. Tolstoy, of course, is simply a Christist who has failed to understand—because perhaps he has never studied—the materialist basis to human thought and activity and who thinks that human loves and hates can be divorced from material conditions when, of course, it is precisely the material motive—the desire for material improvement and the methods of realising it—that brought men into association, into groups and tribes and nations, an association that has given birth to, and moulded, their thoughts and aspirations, their loves and hates and fears.

Generally speaking, man's capacity to love his neighbour will depend upon the economic relationship of both. It is sheer fatuity to expect one to love the other when they are mutually engaged in a grim struggle for the wherewithal to live, a struggle that the conditions governing industry forces upon them. A man may understand that industrial conditions render it impossible for his fellow to do other than battle with him for bread, but he cannot love unless it is possible to conceive of a love that finds expression in a fight in no respect dissimilar from the fight between men who hate and hate wholeheartedly. The law of self preservation impels the fight and the lesson is soon learnt that the victory is to the best later rather than the best lover. It is quite possible that the participants in the struggle may prefer to love each other, but they will understand if they give heed to the Socialist that the only way by which love can be made possible is through the removal of the conditions that necessitate hate. They must first of all remove the conditions that set them at each other's throat. Tolstoy has laid hold of the wrong end of the problem, and it is because his gospel can only have mischievous effects upon the endeavours we are making to organise the working-class upon the basis of their class interests, that we take the opportunity this letter affords to make it clear, upon his own showing, that he is outside the Socialist movement at the same time that we echo the quaintly worded regret of our Japanese comrades that "Tolstoy is yet in error as to Socialism and the solution of social problem just in the same way as the common shallow people do."

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

"An Unauthorised Program" and "Poverty" by R. J. Derfel. These will be noticed in next issue.

Also "Labor," St. Louis; "The Chokugen," Tokio; "La Internacional," Buenos Aires.

Can the Capitalist Class Protect its own Interests?

It is a common assertion that the profit, rent, and interest forming the income of the ruling class is a natural remuneration for its superior intellectual power and for its greater responsibilities. The idea put forth is that profit forms the "wage of management," the "rent of ability" of the capitalist class.

The working-class are warned against the agitator who talks against the capitalist class and the capitalist system of production. The worker is not to be led into opposition to the capitalist whose interests

The Problem stated.

so runs the tale—are in no way opposed to his own. There is a harmony existing between them. The worker must not in any way be led into disturbing that harmony. Capitalism must not be abolished, it must be "moralised." The capitalist must not be treated as an enemy but as a friend. He must not be coerced but must be won over to a recognition of the true position of the workers and he will immediately seek to alleviate it.

A pretty story, forsooth! One which, fortunately for themselves, the working-class are little likely to believe. They know full well that the position of the capitalist-class is opposed to theirs inasmuch as the wealth of the capitalist depends upon the poverty of the worker—the poverty of the worker exists only through the wealth of the capitalist. Profits and dividends are raised when wages are lowered, and any increase of wages under given conditions must necessarily be at the expense of profits and dividends.

This is a very obvious conclusion. The worker creates a certain supply of wealth in a given time. The greater the quantity of that wealth the capitalist takes as profits or dividends the smaller is the quantity remaining for the wealth producers. The endeavour of each class to raise his share as against the other is a necessary result of this state of things and constitutes one of the features of the economic warfare which Socialists have named the class struggle.

Even were it not the case that the ideas of the capitalist-class *qua* capitalist-class are the reflex of their economic position and that they are thereby precluded from understanding the ideas, the longings, the feelings, and the aspirations of the working-class there would be no reason for trusting them. If they knew the sufferings of the worker and wished to redress them is there anything to show for the belief that they would transform those wishes into realities?

We fancy not. To judge from the general ineptitude and inefficiency which they display in dealing with the interests of their own class—the inadequacy of their methods of securing their own class benefits it is at all events conceivable that an even greater degree of ineptitude and inefficiency would arise in dealing with the welfare of an alien class.

In every sphere of life they have monopolised the advantages but have been unable to make the best of them. The fact that their class is based upon a system of virtual slavery seems to stultify their ideals, dwarf their efforts, and belittle their every aim. The canker-worm is at the core of their civilisation, and the greed of gain, the motive power of their civilisation, has forced from their brains and hearts all pure thoughts and lofty ideals. The art, the literature, the drama, the science, the religion, and the politics of the age are purely commercial—the natural products of a commercial age. "Getting and spending they lay waste their powers."

In nothing is this incapacity of our ruling class more manifest than in their foreign policies—a euphemism for the exploitation of the weaker races and for the prevention of such exploitation by races equally strong. Arising

from the productive system and its ramifications in the credit system is the necessity of monopolising markets. From this springs the jealousies between nations, the necessity of protecting commercial spheres of influence. The resultant friction tends to end in the breaking off of diplomatic relations followed by war.

Every civilised country prepares for this. The national politics have more interest in war than in peace and efforts are made to maintain a permanent fighting force for offensive and defensive purposes. To maintain a standing army and navy with a further auxiliary force huge sums are annually expended. Plans are everlastingly being devised for the improvement of our war organisation—plans which receive the authorisation and support of the Executive and are thereupon shelved. Time and again it has been declared to be absolutely imperative to fortify and protect London by a line of forts—and time and again the capitalist-class has done nothing.

Another feature and one of some importance to the ruling class is the fact that Great Britain does not grow her own food supplies. Every year a larger percentage of our wheat is derived from foreign countries, the actual stock of wheat varying from three to fourteen weeks' supply.

In case of a war between the ruling class of this country and some important Continental power, or even between two Continental powers, this fact might have the effect of raising wheat prices to starvation point. Even during the Civil War in America the cost of insurance of goods from America was raised enormously and much more would this be the case in a war in which the British Government was itself engaged. Insurances and freights would be raised, trade and commerce would be hampered, the market would be restricted, prices would rise, and the misery of the worker would be accentuated while the luxury of the capitalist would be diminished.

Much more dangerous would the position be if the country with which this country was at war was one which controlled the source of any considerable section of our wheat supply—say Russia or the United States. The flow of wheat would be stopped at its source and the supply would prove inadequate. To the capitalist this would be of less concern than to the worker, for he who has the longest purse can secure the first draft of an inadequate food supply.

Now to anyone who has studied the food problem it is well known that this country could supply not only sufficient wheat, but also sufficient of every other kind of agricultural and dairy produce to comfortably feed a much larger population than the forty millions who at present inhabit Great Britain.

The annual wheat requirement of the people of this country is at present 6 bushels per head, making a total requirement of 240,000,000 bushels per annum. Of this 60,000,000 bushels are grown at home while the remainder is imported.

Taking this country we find that it possesses the finest wheat growing land in the world. Its productivity per acre—29 bushels—is higher than that of any country which cultivates the cereal upon an equally large scale. Allowing that the present methods of farming are continued and that the average of 29 bushels to the acre could be maintained over a sufficiently large area it would require 13,000 square miles to grow the whole quantity needed for consumption in this country. The area of the United Kingdom—121,000 square miles—should surely allow of this placing of 13,000 square miles under wheat culture. Kropotkin gives the cultivable areas as 50,000 square miles.

At present we have in the United Kingdom under cultivation:—

Wheat	...	5,000	square miles.
Barley	...	3,400	"
Oats	...	6,500	"

making a total of 12,900 square miles devoted to the cultivation of mixed cereals.

Again, we are informed by scientific agriculturists that by intensive agriculture—that is by a system under which the soil is specially prepared, where deep ploughing is resorted to, where the seeds are selected by the progressive eliminating of the unfit, an immense increase of

productivity is to be secured.

The attitude of the Socialist.

To the Socialist who has neither country nor patriotism it matters little whether England feeds herself or not. With true international sympathy he wishes to obtain the means of satisfying the material requirements of himself and his fellows with as little expenditure of social effort as possible. But from the point of view of the patriot it is very singular that, possessing the power of producing sufficient for home requirements, we continue importing the greater portion of our food supplies.

Every year a large portion of the land is allowed to go out of cultivation and the problem becomes intensified. Men give place to deer in many parts of the country. Now it would be easy to show that there are limitations—individual and economic—preventing the British farmer from holding his own with his competitor in other countries. On another occasion I may be permitted to discuss them at length.

It seems strange that the ruling class of this country holding the power of entirely solving this problem of food production should do nothing to solve it. The solution, however, involves the resumption of ownership of the land by the people, and it has been written on the scrolls of fate that in the transformation of individual private property into collectivist common property the land must come last.

We have then to consider the ruling class cannot administer the country—they can only drift upon the current of progress.

They are an effete and impotent class, ruling by the power of the *status quo*. With them the working-class has no interest in common and the worker must learn that it is only by consciously organising himself in a political party for the purpose of getting rid of this capitalist class that he can in any way help forward the emancipation of his class.

R.E.

"ELECTIONITIS."

Of course, the critics have been harping at me about my arguments in the last issue. It is a way that critics have, and I believe other notabilities have been victims of this species of organic life which is so hard to classify. The particular snaffle of the unspeakable order whom I have in my mind's eye at the moment appears to base his claim to lay down the law economic on the fact that he has read W. T. Stead's *If Christ came to Chicago*. One point he maintains is that the return to labour is dominated by the cost of subsistence, and, too modest to claim that his pronouncement alone places the matter beyond dispute, he says that Karl Marx agrees with him. Well, to save trouble, I will agree with him also, after which there is nothing more to be said upon the matter. But having thus simply established the great truth that the return to labour is dominated by the cost of subsistence, we have still to deal with the inquisitive man's query, "Why?" And from what I know of the inquisitive man he is not likely to be satisfied with the woman's answer (if I may say it without raising the sex question) "Because it is."

Now I do not wish to be understood to imply that the variations in the relative proportions of supply and demand in the labour market are to be explained by the accelerated or retarded growth of the working-class population. In stating that a greater material return to labour must result in an increased production of labour-power I have made the proviso that other conditions remain constant. Such a consumption under the given conditions would, of course, be only the insistence of the natural law of life. But capitalism has laws of its own, and my point is that it is these laws of capitalism that determine that the return to labour shall fluctuate about a certain point and which set limitations upon, or, I dare narrow it down to this—render utterly ineffective, any and all interference of man save such interference take the shape of the abolition of the form of pro-

duction which is supported by these laws.

To insist that, under certain conditions, an increased return to labour will result in an increased production of labour-power is not by any means to say that such result will take place in fact. If other things did remain unaltered, that is to say, if the increased return to labour which the palliatives aim at did not set in motion certain antagonistic and irresistible forces which would presently compensate capital for its previous disbursement, then such increased return to labour must have the result I have indicated. I would venture to suggest, seemingly against the opinion of Marx, and therefore with humility, that capital does to a certain extent, and by a deeper and steadier movement than the more apparent ones to be mentioned later, as the tide is deeper and steadier than the waves, regulate the supply of labour-power to its *average* requirements (perhaps it would be more correct to attribute this activity to forces outside capital) by controlling the growth of the working-class population. It seems to me that only by this movement can the cost of its production dominate the value of labour-power, while its price is more directly under the influence of other movements. Whether this is correct or not matters very little at this juncture. Karl Marx shows very clearly that the labour market appears relatively full or empty, not on account of any absolute increase or decrease of the number of the wage-workers, but because the contraction or expansion of capital, calling for less or more labour-power in its operations, alters the proportion of the employed to the unemployed among the workers. This, then, is the outline of the process by which capital controls the supply of labour:

Capital, growing by the absorption of profit, increases faster than the working-class population, restricted as the latter is by the degree of exploitation, and presently outstrips the supply of labour-power. The result of this is a rise in wages; and since this can only take place at the expense of the rate of surplus-value, the growth of capital is checked, firstly by the reduction of the proportion of profit which it *could* possibly add to itself, and secondly (owing to the decreased rate of profit offering smaller incentive to productive activity) by the reduction of the proportion of realised profit which is converted into new capital. So the growth of capital itself raises up obstacles to its continued expansion, and it next proceeds to remove those obstacles. The relative proportion of the unemployed to employed having fallen below the point of greatest advantage to capital, the latter sets about a readjustment of the labour-market. This is accomplished by the simple expedient of increasing the productivity of labour. Machinery already in partial use becomes profitable to a still larger circle of employers; invention is quickened and new machinery, throwing many out of employment and consequently into the reserve army of labour on the one hand, on the other hand places at the disposal of capital another and lower strata of labour-power. And the supply of surplus labour-power having been so adjusted to the needs of capital, wages again decrease, larger profits again stimulate industrial activity, capital expands by leaps and bounds and rushes on till it raises again in its path the obstacle to extension—a relatively small unemployed or industrial reserve army. And so the round is repeated.

All this is on the authority of Karl Marx. Whether it is endorsed by the author of *If Christ came to Chicago* I am unable to say: perhaps my critic can. And that reminds me that the latter has led me rather away from my intended line of argument, which was to show that, given the competitive labour-market—the very vital spot of capitalism—the return to labour is prescribed by laws which, while permitting temporary interferences, use the effects of these interferences as a means of restoring the normal degree of exploitation, and even of exacting compensation for the earlier advantage such interference may have given the workers, and that, therefore, all such artificial interferences with the return to labour (in which category we must place nearly all the so-called palliatives) must fail to effect their purpose of bettering the material conditions of the working-class. That they might benefit a section I will not deny, but I, for one, if I desired the advancement of any section, see no reason why I

should not rest content with the magnificence of the capitalist section.

Let any thinking man study the working of the marvellous laws by which capital, sensitive to every fluctuation in the flow of its life's blood, profit, controls the material conditions of those whom it only suffers to exist for the purpose of producing that profit, and then, having learned how faithfully capital is served by these laws, he may judge how little they may be defied or circumvented. Let him observe how a rise in wages is met by the extension of the circle of the profitable employment of machinery, how the shorter day is counterbalanced by speeding up and increased output, how the depleted labour market is rendered fat and redundant by the contraction of capital and the greater use of labour-saving machinery, how every effort of man to find some little amelioration is baffled and beaten by those vigilant sheep-dogs, the laws of capital; and observing all these movements, tireless and irresistible as the tides, he will begin at last to understand why we so steadily refuse to direct the workers' strength to be broken against these implacable laws.

The palliatives, so far from being desirable to the workers, are very quicksands for the entanglement of working-class feet. They are the means of seduction in the cunning hands of capital, and possess a power for capitalist defence that only the stewards of capital seem to realise. These gentlemen know that they properly belong to capital's armoury. To how many of us is the tale familiar, of the Russian noble who was chased by wolves. He was up to the palliative dodge. One article after another he flung to the wolves for them to wrangle and delay over, and they missed their prey after all. This is the chief use of reforms. Cleverly handled there is a century of respite for capitalism in the palliative programme of the reform parties—and who can doubt that they will be cleverly handled?

Those who are urging the workers on after the palliative chimera are assuming a responsibility of profound gravity, notwithstanding that they take it up lightly as a child draws breath. That they assume this responsibility in the name of Socialism compels our strenuous opposition: we dare not be silent because we dare not be implicated. We do not doubt that a certain early progress will attend the efforts of the reformers: that is always the portion of those who take the line of least resistance. But when the lever meets little resistance it is moving little weight; and the weight we are trying to get our lever under is a stupendous one.

The effect of "electionitis" upon those who yield themselves guarded by anything less than the most stringent and exclusive of Socialist restrictions, up to its seduction, is utter political prostitution. Examples of the truth of this statement might be given *ad nauseam*, but one case which has recently come under my notice will suffice. At this November election in West Ham the Stratford Branch S.D.F. contested the High Street Ward. A really sterling Election Address was rounded off by the usual list of palliatives which the candidate pledged himself to work for in order to "ease" the condition of the workers. And among others appears this:—

"School Board and Poor Rate to be a national charge." I do not know whether I should be sooner forgiven if I credited the participants with unshunnable dishonesty or with incredible ignorance, but, fortunately, the choice is not mine. The clear drafting of the Address testifies to their knowledge of the position, and so doing convicts them of dishonesty. Further, the members of this branch have recently lifted themselves on to the pedestal of notoriety by the vehemence with which they have publicly asserted that rates are no concern of the workers, and that they did not care if they went up "to twenty shillings in the pound." If rates are the concern of the workers it is dishonest to say they are not; if they are no concern of the workers it is treachery for working-class representatives to pledge themselves in connection with them. It is interesting to recall that "electionitis" three years ago led the Committee fighting this ward to dodge a resolution which the present scribe got passed, to the effect "that Terrett be not allowed on MacAllen's platform," by the simple expedient of putting MacAllen on Terrett's platform! Which makes one sigh for the honour even of thieves.

A. E. JACOB.

SOCIALISM AND RESPECTABILITY.

SOCIALISM is the political expression of the recognition by the working-class of their suppression and oppression under the present form of society, based as it is upon their exploitation, and politically administered as it is solely with a view to conserving, and, as far as possible, perpetuating their exploitation and subjection.

Like every other social ideal in which men expressed their wants and aspirations, Socialism has its history, its stages of growth. The working-class, oppressed from birth, have made manifest their desire for human conditions—for liberty—in stages which correspond with the stages of social development by and through which the working-class have arrived at their present numerical proportion to the rest of the population, their present degree of want and suffering, of interdependence and of knowledge, and their present fast developing determination to have Socialism, and with it liberty, and to have it *now*. The first vague conception of Socialism was born in the study of the leisured philosopher—a suggestion thrown out by men of culture for the better drilling and re-organisation of the non-cultured, common people. And for long it remained the plaything of Culture.

The working-class struggle for emancipation was at first weak, spasmodic, vague. Here a rick-burning, there a machinery-smashing riot; here a tempestuous revolt, there an abject petitioning of king, kaiser, or local magnate, for pity on the poor. But as the working-class grew with the development of capitalism, they learnt the lessons which are best learnt and longest remembered by those who have eaten the bread of affliction and drunk the waters of bitterness. They had tried individual revolt, and by its failure learnt the necessity of organised collective effort. They had tried by begging to obtain concessions, and had been treated as beggars. They had tried political efforts aimed at reform, had had reforms promised by capitalist politicians, had used their votes and voices to help these capitalist politicians wring the last vestige of political power from the aristocracy—only to find that promises have a proverbial use, that the little finger of Rehoboam was thicker than the loins of Solomon. Thus the working-class learned that their emancipation could only be achieved by a collective effort, organised and intelligently aimed at the conquest of the political power and the effecting in the teeth of their oppressors of a Socialist Revolution. The intelligent movement of the working-class towards emancipation reached maturity in the struggle for Socialism and the lessons learnt in their life of struggle and suffering are crystallised in the Principles of The Socialist Party of Great Britain. Bearing in mind this process by which Socialism was brought into being, nourished and developed, we have a scientific touchstone by which to discover the real inwardness of any one of the many volumes (professing to expound Socialism) which have been launched upon a suffering public.

And the "latest born and (more or less) loveliest far" of these is "Socialism and Society," by Mr. J. R. MacDonald, a leader of the I.L.P. (a body whose ruling delusion is that it is a Socialist Party) and secretary and high priest of the L.R.C., whose "independent" "working-class" Members of Parliament hang loyally on to the tail of the Liberal Party.

The book seems to have been written in order to justify the round-about road to the Liberal rump which these two bodies conjointly think it necessary to follow, but probably few even of his friends will be able to unreservedly congratulate Mr. MacDonald on the result of his efforts, while an entirely unbiassed critic may well set to marvelling why he wrote the book at all.

The first obstacle to front him is the Revolutionary ferocity of the angry working-class, and the old, old, scientific lumber is trotted out; the blessed word "evolution" is many times invoked to show that "revolution" is a dark impossibility, and that the class-struggle does not exist and, with much magical muttering of "science" and "Darwin," that the establishment of the State of Socialism must be the work of a select

company of cultured persons, elected by a grateful working-class who will wait patiently while the Elected Persons solemnly proceed to discuss, and perhaps to pass, a series of measures of experimental amelioration—"laboratory experiment, not revolution, is the method of Socialism emerged from its Utopian and pseudo-scientific stages," (p. 179). "Public ownership, after all, is Socialism," (p. 59, footnote.)

In writing a complete explanation of what Socialism is and bringing it to this conclusion, Mr. MacDonald is compelled to fall foul of most of the recognised classics of Socialism. Especially is he dogged at every step by the grim and terrible spectre of Marx. At least a fourth of the book is given up to a detailed attack upon Marx and Engels, but, as usual, the criticism does not betray even a nodding acquaintance with the writings criticised. Mr. MacDonald reads "the emancipation of the working-class must be the work of the working-class itself." This is enough. It is revolution! It is Utopian! It is not scientific! It is vulgar! It is not "respectable!" Marx, it seems, is not the first of the scientific Socialists; he is the "last of the Utopians." And the first of the scientific Socialists is Mr. J. R. MacDonald, who has made Socialism respectable!

Mr. MacDonald has put into words the thoughts of the small middle-class. To understand what this class think it is necessary to look at the relative social position they occupy, viz., sandwiched between the working-class on the one hand and the capitalist-class proper on the other. They are threatened with extinction from both sides. Every move forward of capital flings a section of them down into the ranks of the working-class. Every day that brings the working-class closer together and impels them to the grimly inevitable battle for emancipation threatens them with extinction. Hence the small middle-class (the class of small producers, shopkeepers, house-owners, journalists, and professional Respectability generally) is in *word* the most Reactionary, and in *deed* the most Reactionary of all existing sections. They shriek against capital—because of their imminent bankruptcy—and call upon the workers to help limit its power. They shriek at the working-class for its revolutionary tendency, and call upon capital to help them preserve "Law and Order," "Property, Religion, and Respectability."

And the nearer their end the louder their screams.

To this see-saw striving of this class can be traced all the elements of confusion in present day politics:—Single Tax and Land Nationalisation, Free Meals and Farm Colonies, Passive Resistance and Municipalised Milk. And hence also Mr. J. R. MacDonald's self-contradiction is the clearest proof that his "Socialism" and his "society" are the "Socialism and society" of the Respectable Small Middle-Class. Mr. MacDonald denies that a class-war exists on one page and on another proves its existence:— "Thus we see how machinery which might lighten labour, supplants it when used in the interests of a capitalist class. . . . Thus we see how tools, a dead factor, rule men, the living factor in production, and how a class engaging in production for profits controls the class which takes part in production in order to maintain life. . . . A pillar of Sabbatarianism can prove satisfactorily to himself that his works must . . . go seven days in the week. The owner of the land and the means of production is the owner of the lives of the people. He holds society in the hollow of his hand." (pp. 52-53.) And of course there must be no revolution: the working-class must patiently endure while MacDonald & Co. "experiment."

I should have liked to have gone over Mr. MacDonald's critique of Marx in detail, but the Editor of T.S.S. says that he doesn't want serials. However, Marx has retorted on MacDonald and his light by prophetic anticipation:

"He wished to be the sympathiser; he is a composite error. He wished to soar as a man of science above the Bourgeoisie and the proletarians; he is only the petty bourgeois, tossed about continually between capital and labour, between political economy and communism." *The Poverty of Philosophy*.

And again: "A part of the bourgeoisie is desirous of redressing social grievances, in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois

society. To this section belong economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, improvers of the condition of the working-class, organisers of charity, members of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, temperance fanatics, hole and corner reformers of every imaginable kind. This form of Socialism has, moreover, been worked out into complete systems." We may cite Mr. J. R. MacDonald's "Socialism and Society" as an example of this form. "The Socialistic bourgeoisie want all the advantages of modern social conditions without the struggles and dangers necessarily resulting therefrom. They desire the existing state of society minus its revolutionary and disintegrating elements. They desire a bourgeoisie without a proletariat. . . . Bourgeois Socialism attains adequate expression when and only when it becomes a mere figure of speech. Free Trade: for the benefit of the working-class. Protective duties: for the benefit of the working-class. Prison Reform: for the benefit of the working-class. This is the last word and the only seriously meant word of Bourgeois Socialism. It is summed up in the phrase: the bourgeoisie is a bourgeoisie for the benefit of the working-class!" *Communist Manifesto*.

The ethics of Socialism, says J. R. MacDonald, are provided by Evangelicalism: its politics by Liberalism. We leave the courteous reader to the task of picturing a Holy Trinity compounded of "General" Booth, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, and Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald!

THOS. A. JACKSON.

LITERARY CURIOSITIES.

No. 2.—TOLSTOY ON SOCIALISM.

[Reprinted from "The Chokugen" (the plain speaker), the organ of the Socialist Party of Japan.]

Toula, Yasnaya Poliana.

Dear friend Isoo Abe (Editor, the Chokugen). It was a great pleasure for me to receive your letter and your paper, with the English article. I thank you heartily for both.

Though I never doubted that there are in Japan a great many reasonable, moral and religious men, who are opposed to the horrible crime of war, which is now perpetrated by both betrayed and stupefied nations, I was very glad to get the proof of it.

It is a great joy for me to know that I have friends and co-workers in Japan, with which I can be in friendly intercourse.

Wishing to be quite sincere with you, as I wish to be with every esteemed friend, I must tell you that I do not approve of socialism and am sorry to know that the most spiritually advanced part of you—so clever and energetic—people has taken from Europe the very feeble, illusory and fallacious theory of socialism, which in Europe is beginning to be abandoned.

Socialism has for its aim the satisfaction of the meanest part of human nature—his material well-being and by the means it proposes, can never attain them.

The true well-being of humanity is spiritual i.e. moral and includes the material well-being. And this higher goal can be attained only by religious i.e. moral perfection of all the units which composes nations and humanity.

By religion I understand the reasonable belief in a (general for all humanity) law of God, which practically is exposed in the precept of loving every man and doing to every body what one wishes to be done to you.

I know that this method seems to be less expedient than socialism and other frail theories, but it is the sole true one. And all the efforts we make in trying to realise false and not reaching their aims—theories only hinder as to employ true means to attain the degree of happiness of mankind and of every individual which is proper to its times.

Excuse me for the liberty I take to discuss your creed, and for my bad English and believe me to be your true friend

LEO TOLSTOY.

During the September quarter the London Society of Composers paid in provident allowances, 7,406l. 6s. 3d., of which 1,545l. had to be raised by sale of Consols.

BORING FROM WITHIN.

The article on Trade Unionism that appeared in the September issue of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD evoked considerable criticism amongst the members of the Party. The article did not quite convey the idea of the writer, having to be condensed because of the demands upon our space. The critics mainly contend that what was advocated was "boring from within," and some condemn the article because of that. Let us look at the facts.

Most comrades understand and admit that trade organisation is essential, essential for two reasons: firstly, because of immediate help by organisation; secondly, and this is most important, because with the proper organisation of the workers on industrial lines the foundation of the industrial democracy of the Socialist Republic is laid. The unions cannot be ignored and we *must* have Socialist Industrial Unions. Here, then, arises the difficulty. We do not think much good can be done with the existing unions: they are too deeply in the rut of the old craft antagonisms—the splitting up of the working-class, and their "leaders" being mainly interested in perpetuating this sectional strife because of their paid jobs, sell out the interests of the union members and keep their hold on the unions to prevent any great headway being made.

We Socialists want to see Industrial Unionism, that is, we want to see *all* the workers in each trade organised, and the various trades in each industry affiliated to the one union, and the various industrial divisions again affiliated, thus forming one huge, cohesive organisation of the workers. Still further, when the workers are organised in the factory, workshop, or elsewhere, for the overthrow and not the perpetuation of capitalism, then the other phase must come into play—they must endorse and support only the political party of their emancipation, that is, the Socialist Party. Without industrial organisation no political progress, without political organisation no sound economic progress. Just as the capitalist class exerts its power, both in the workshop and in the governing bodies, so must the organised workers use their power in both ways. Neither is complete in itself. The working-class organised on the political field for its emancipation must act in conjunction with its counterpart on the industrial field. None of the existing unions is organised in this way, and all the alleged progress made by Social Democrats and I.L.P.s is proved, upon investigation, to be fictitious. The South West District L.R.C. and Trades and Labour Council is a case in point. Besides, none of the "borders from within" has condemned the present method of organisation, on the contrary, some of them have, so far as outside evidence shows, quietly acquiesced in acts of the most deliberate treachery it is possible to conceive of. In some unions it has been these Social Democrats and I.L.P.s who have instigated the infamous business.

Undoubtedly, the members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain will have to do on the economic field what they have already done on the political field, namely, establish a sound organisation because not one exists at present. But let it be borne in mind that we are a young Party, that it will take some years to build up a revolutionary political party, and that at present we have not the numerical and financial strength to organise the Socialist Industrial Alliance. We cannot have a Party without members, therefore we have to be propagandists. We cannot have Trade Unions without wage-workers, therefore, if we would move in an intelligent manner, we must carry on an organised agitation and education within the existing unions to which our members belong, so as to form a nucleus of sound Socialists in each. They should proceed with the educational work to endeavour to capture the unions as they stand at present a very remote possibility and also that they can get a sufficient number of sound men within the unions so that when we are strong enough, and conditions are ripe, we can call them out to form the foundation of the Socialist Union.

Thus, and this alone, is the excuse for a

member's active participation in the work inside existing unions. Better do this and build a solid foundation, by education, even as we are doing within the Party at present, than pass pious resolutions instructing the E.C. to form Socialist Unions at a time when it is a numerical and financial impossibility. Let us condemn and expose the rottenness of the existing unions and the treachery of those who boss them. Let us educate to the best of our ability and opportunity the rank and file to a proper appreciation of the situation, and we shall be doing some of the necessary pioneering for the new Socialist Industrial Union.

E. J. B. ALLEN.

FROM OUR BRANCHES.

ISLINGTON.

We are still successfully carrying on our outdoor operations in this district, and during September we reached our highest sale of *The Socialist Standard*, having sold 338 copies of No. 13. Up to the end of September we had sold 529 copies of the Party Manifesto; if other branches are doing as well the entire edition will shortly be exhausted. The people are asking us for further literature, which we trust the Party will issue early next year. The collections taken up at our meetings are well maintained, and the Party Treasurer receives his quota thereof each month. Our flourishing financial position enables us to make a donation every month to the Party Organ Fund, and the Islington comrades have not been slow in contributing their share towards the expenses of the new Central Office of the Party.

These excellent results are due in no small degree to the able assistance of Party speakers like comrades Fitzgerald and Jackson. Jackson's addresses bear the unmistakable impress of a fertile and studious mind, and we look forward with confidence to his career as a platform exponent of the principles of the Party.

The Islington Branch has invited Comrade Jackson to deliver a series of lectures on "The Philosophy of Socialism." These lectures commenced on October 24th and will be continued every Tuesday, 9 p.m., at the Co-operative Stores, 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. There will be about 13 lectures altogether. The course will differ from the usual style of economic class, as it is the intention of the lecturer to approach the science of Socialism by easy political, sociological and historical studies, illustrated by examples drawn from geology and biology.

C. LEHANE.

NORTH LONDON DISTRICT COUNCIL.

Seeing that this Council has done a considerable amount of propaganda work, and seeing that the work has been very successful, it is but right and proper that it should be put on record in the Official Organ of the Party. Week night meetings were run throughout July, August, and September, and in some cases are being continued during October. These meetings, including the stations at Garmant Place, Clerkenwell; Highbury Corner; St. Ann's, Tottenham; High St., Hornsey; Waltham Abbey and Waltham Cross—have, in many cases been excellent, with large sales of literature and good collections. Six meetings per week exclusive of Sunday, is, in brief, the Report of the Council for this small district for the three months. Next year we are confident of being able to improve upon this, for we have plenty of speakers, actual and potential, and abundance of energy and enthusiasm. While we wait, somewhat impatiently, for the return of Spring with its opportunities for outdoor work, we are not idle, and our indoor lectures at Dovecot Hall, Wood Green, are most gratifying. All along the line we are gaining ground. Conscious of the correctness of our principles, and of the honesty and justice of our purpose, and confident that the workers of North London will eventually realise, as we have done, that their only hope lies in Socialism, we are content to peg away in our endeavours to show that by and through our methods alone can the advent of Socialism be hastened.

DICK KENT, Sec.

Back numbers of *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD* can be had through any Branch Secretary.

Printed by Jacob Comb Bros., 2a Wingfield Rd., Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published by G. C. H. Carter, 1A, Caledonian Rd., London, N.

S.P.G.B.

North London District Council.

LECTURES FOR NOVEMBER.

: DOVECOTE HALL, :
78, High Road, Wood Green, at 7.30.

Nov. 5th—F. C. WATTS:

"Working-Class Politics."

Nov. 12th—J. KENT:

"Socialism and Free Maintenance."

Nov. 19th—T. W. ALLEN:

Subject to be announced.

Nov. 26th—W. GIFFORD:

"Evolution of Society."

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY. No. 1.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN,

Containing, in full detail, a statement of the

Principles, Policy, & Rules OF THE PARTY.

Post free, 1 copy, 11d.; 6 copies, 5d.; 12 copies, 9d. Special terms for larger quantities. Orders and remittances should be forwarded to the Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT.

The first instalment of our translation of

KARL KAUTSKY'S ERFURTER PROGRAMME

is held over, our Comrade Kautsky not having yet returned the manuscript to us.

VOL. I.

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Well bound in stiff boards.

Post Free 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be sent to Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as well as anyone else.

JACOMB BROS., T.U. Printers,
Wingfield Rd., Stratford.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE:

1A, CALEDONIAN RD., KING'S CROSS, LONDON, N.
General Secretary: G. C. H. CARTER.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Mathew St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL.—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 34, Wilton Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 34, Wilton Square, W.C.

EAST HAM.—G. Wilson, Sec., 14, Coleridge Avenue, Manor Park, E. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 at above address.

EDMONTON.—R. Kenny, Secretary, 34, Vernon Rd., Tottenham, N. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM.—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 309, North End Road, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON.—C. Thorp, Sec., 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Tuesdays at 8.30 at the Co-op. Stores, 79, Grove Rd., Holloway.

PADDINGTON.—T. A. Wilson, Sec., 24, Mostyn Gardens, Kensal Rise. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at Ollins' Coffee Tavern (foot of Lock Bridge), Harrow Road.

PECKHAM.—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. Debates alternate Tuesdays. All invited.

TOOTING.—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—J. W. Robertson, Secretary, 17, Erherley Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m. at above address.

WATFORD.—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in month at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM.—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Park Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at Spiritualist Hall, 32, Dames Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Comrades desiring to acquire or sell books on Social Science, etc. (new or second-hand), should send particulars to the Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N., from whom the undermentioned unsorted works may be obtained at prices stated.

CAPITAL.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION.

By KARL MARX.

(Published at 10.6.)

Carriage Free 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES.

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LABOUR

By PROF. J. E. THOROLD ROGERS.

(New Edition, Revised, Published at 10.6.)

Carriage Free 5s. 6d.

POVERTY.

A STUDY OF TOWN LIFE.

By B. SEEBOHM ROWNTREE.

(Illustrated by Folding Maps, Diagrams, &c.)
(Published at 10.6.)

Carriage Free 4s. 6d.

The
Official Organ
of
The
Socialist Party
of
Great Britain.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

No. 16. Vol. 2.]

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1905.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

HOLDS

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master-class, and the consequent enslavement of the working-class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working-class from the domination of the master-class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working-class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working-class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working-class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist-class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working-class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working-class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master-class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working-class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Readers who can endorse the foregoing in its entirety are invited to communicate with the Secretary of the nearest Branch or with the General Secretary. See Directory, page 8.

STUMBLING BLOCKS.

SOME QUESTIONS ASKED AND ANSWERED.

Mr. H. J. Priest (Islington) sends the following five questions, which we answer.

1. *Should all reforms be opposed by the members of the S.P.G.B.?*

Our members oppose no reform which benefits the working-class.

We, however, resolutely decline to barter our Socialism for some vague promise of reform that resembles the proverbial pie crust. We decline to support an enemy, who is utterly opposed to us on the most important points, because he promises some minor measure.

Further, practically the whole of the so-called "reforms" at present proposed would not, under present class rule and economic conditions, materially benefit the workers if obtained.

2. *Are the reforms for which our forebears fought, useless—e.g., The Factory Acts, Free Speech, and the Education Acts?*

The reforms to which Mr. Priest refers are not useless and have never been characterised as such by the S.P.G.B. They are, however, all echoes of the last class struggle.

The passing of the Factory Acts (particularly that of 1847) was largely due to the Tory landed aristocracy in revenge for the Corn Laws, and in vain attempt to stem the rising tide of manufacture, to stop the desertion of the land for the factory, and to hinder the mill owners in competition with the agriculturists for the available supply of labour power. On the part also of the more far-seeing manufacturers and Tories alike, it was to prevent the loss to the ruling class that would follow the utter degeneration of the working-class goose that laid the golden eggs. How near this was may be judged from Engels' "Condition of the Working Class in 1844."

For long the Factory Acts were rendered practically inoperative by the manufacturers, until they slowly discovered that, in moderation, the Acts did not diminish, but rather increased efficiency, output, and profits. We counsel our friend to examine the present Acts and their working; he will not find much to be proud of.

Free Speech and Education Acts were essential to the development of Capitalism, and were the work of the modern capitalist class on its advent to political power. Free Speech as a necessary corollary to free competition and the development of trade; Education Acts, in order that the wage slaves should be more efficient and therefore cheaper.

Just as capitalist development renders Socialism inevitable, so also do many of the measures which were indispensable to Capitalism, prepare the way for Socialism in spite of the interests which promoted them.

3. *Are the people in Russia fighting for phantoms in fighting for reforms?*

This question hangs closely to the previous one, and the subject has been dealt with in No. 6 of this journal. Historically the people of Russia are fighting the battle of middle class emancipation. They are fighting precisely the same battle that our forefathers fought; and this is the secret of capitalist sympathy for

Russian revolutionists.

It must not be forgotten how backward Russia is in economic development. Only 12 per cent. of her population live in towns, whilst commerce and great industry are largely in foreign hands. Hence the Russian industrial capitalist has still his emancipation to achieve.

Though the populace is in the towns, largely leavened with Socialist teaching, economic development is not yet ripe for Socialism, whilst it is largely a cloak for middle class aspirations.

The freeing of the growing Russian industry from the strangling grasp of autocracy is the next step in social advance, and necessarily compels the support of the Russian working-class.

Let our friend notice also that the work is being done by a revolutionary movement, not for the abolition of Czarism, not for its reform. Showing thereby that a revolutionary movement is far more efficacious even in the obtaining of concessions than is a timid reform movement. But reform cannot satisfy modern Russian conditions, for so long as Feudal Czarism is left in control, so long will it use its power in its own interests against the other classes in the state. Nothing but the deprival of the Russian feudal class of the control of the machinery of government can meet the present needs of Russia.

This means revolution: it means the advent to administrative control of a new class; a class thrust forward by economic development. It means Bourgeois supremacy, leavened, let us hope, by working-class influence.

What Mr. Priest calls reform in Russia really spells revolution: the rise of a new class to the helm of the State, and the breaking down of the barriers to the untrammelled development of industry in that country; the inevitable, but let us hope brief, precursor of the Socialist Commonwealth.

The bloodshed and disorder which too often accompany revolution are due to desperate efforts of the ruling class to cling to power, to retain their domination over society, in their own interests in spite of the changed conditions and the will of the people.

The victory of the third estate in Russia, accomplished necessarily with the aid of the workers, will doubtless see a strong Socialist party on its feet to keep pace with the ever more rapid economic development, profiting by the experience of the more advanced countries, until the time arrives for proletarian triumph, when class distinctions are abolished, and the people come by their own.

4. *Are not well-to-do, well-to-behaved, well-educated proletarians more useful to Socialists than uneducated, uneducated, ignorant, and unskilled labourers?*

From social history one fact stands clearly out: that great political movements do not depend for their success upon the actual property or otherwise of their participants, but upon far deeper economic causes. Thord Rogers points out the frequency of great social discontent in prosperous times, and gives the Peasants' War in England as an example.

whilst we know numerous instances of great political changes which have been effected by the people in times of direst distress. It can hardly be said that the organised and determined movement of the Russian people is connected with a surfeit of food, education and leisure.

But is it at all probable that the modern proletarians (i.e., propertyless) will become well fed, well educated and leisured persons, otherwise than by their emancipation from wage-slavery? Is it not true that there is an alarming and continued growth in lunacy, degeneracy and pauperism? Is not toil daily becoming more intense and employment more insecure? Are not wages on the decline, and is not the modern worker worn out at an earlier age than his forefathers?

There is, unfortunately, but little hope that the conditions of the working-class can materially improve under capitalist rule. The ruling class will secure that the amount of their rent, interest and profit shall not diminish by being expended unprofitably to themselves upon the means by which their wealth is created; and the growing intensity of competition nips in the bud any attempt at genuine aid to the workers by even the most kindly disposed. The growth of the unemployed side by side with the intensification of toil and decline in wages, are features inherent in capitalist development; and the ruling class cannot deal with these without committing social suicide.

The more capitalism presses upon the proletariat, the more nearly is the remedy placed within reach. Taught discipline in the factory, the workers will be forced to discipline themselves into economic and political organisations: whilst the concentration of wealth into fewer hands, the trustification of industry, the growing gulf between the two classes, increasing wealth in face of spreading poverty, declining wages in face of greater productivity, all make the issues clearer to the workers and show to them that the way out of their misery is to take and hold the vast means of producing wealth, and so transform these from instruments of public oppression and private profit, into social instruments for social well-being.

Through Socialism alone can education, leisure and a material existence worthy the name become a possibility for the workers, and their physical, mental and moral uplifting a reality.

In face of the growing contradictions, and ever more glaring anomalies of capitalist society who can doubt that the toilers will, like Jonathan in the day of battle, "taste of the wild honey in the wood and find their eyes enlightened"?

5. *Are Socialists, who, while admitting that it is not Socialism, yet support reforms purporting to improve the condition of the workers, to be considered deceiving birds and traitors to Socialism?*

This question is answered in our reply to No. 1. We have only to add that those who realize the truth of our principles, yet who attempt to wheel the workers into line on some petty issue behind one section or other of the capitalist party, are traitors to the working-class and should be branded as such.

If the workers are content to support capitalism and capitalist candidates for the sake of "reforms" that are useful to capitalism and a capitalist government will grant no other unless by fear of extinction, then, we say, the removal of the cause of working-class misery is indefinitely postponed.

The degradation and impoverishment of the workers are due to capitalist exploitation, and this, no mere reform can end. Our supreme aim must therefore be the abolition of the system of robbery.

It is less difficult to convince the average worker of the necessity for Socialism, than it is to convince him of the necessity for some dozen ineffective reforms; while it is infinitely more useful.

LANDLORDISM!

A gentleman in New Orleans was agreeably surprised to find a plump turkey served up for dinner one day, and enquired of his negro servant how it was obtained. "Why, sir," said Sambo, "dat turkey him roost on our fence tree nights, so dis morning we seize him for de rent ob de fence."

THE RUSSIAN UPEHAVAL.

THE Pseudo-Socialist Press and Organisations, who here at home are preaching social reform and palliation as *bona fide* Socialism with impunity, have naturally not the least compunction in presenting international labour struggles or national working-class action in other countries in the light of the reform movement. Their accounts and criticisms of recent Russian events have been so grossly misleading and exaggerated as to the real proletarian position that it becomes necessary to place before the workers of this country, however briefly, the situation in Russia from the Socialist standpoint.

Some of the aforementioned critics have asserted that large numbers of those Russian workers who have been and are now engaged in strikes and demonstrations against the Government are class-conscious Socialists fighting the "social battle" of the working-class; others have praised the principles of the General Strike as deserving emulation by a "United Socialist Party in Great Britain" and especially as a prelude to the "Social Revolution"; and others again, particularly those who, believing in the emancipation of the workers by a long series of reforms enacted by a Liberal-cum-Labour party, have expressed their admiration of the intelligence and tact displayed by the Russian toilers in "working so gallantly hand-in-hand with the other forces of progress and revolution in the corrupt Empire of the Czar" for, as they call it, the "freedom of all."

No one can gainsay the fact that the Russian workers have in the present upheaval shown great power of organisation and class solidarity, but, on the other hand, nobody understanding even in the smallest degree the causes of the present Russian crisis can honestly assert that the struggle in which the Russian workers now are taking part by means of strikes and demonstrations is distinctly working-class in character.

In order to obtain a clear conception of the real meaning of the whole outbreak it is necessary to consider briefly the historic course and present stage of Russian economic development.

Although factories and workshops in Russia date from the period in which Peter the Great ascended the throne (1696), the beginning of modern capitalism, the industrialism of this epoch, can be distinctly traced to the sixties of the nineteenth century. When in 1861, Alexander the Second by an imperial ukase abolished serfdom it was not for the purpose of uplifting the toilers, but this breaking of ancient ties, so vociferously applauded at the time by the bourgeoisie of other countries, had become an economic necessity. Russia, whose industrial activity had until then almost exclusively been given to agriculture, was suddenly roused to the fact that the new world with its virgin soil, its highly developed machinery and scientific methods of production was becoming not only a formidable competitor in the international markets of agricultural produce, but that Russia ran the risk of being altogether cut out, unless it encouraged and helped on agricultural production on modern capitalist lines. Above all was the "Liberation of the serfs" directed towards the creation of a working-class, free to sell its labour power to the highest bidder, a class which, being without property and unable to find employment on the land, would migrate to the towns, there to enable the bourgeoisie to develop industrialism like the rest of western civilisation.

At the present time two-fifths of the land in Russia is held by the State, consisting mostly of forests and wasteland; one-fourth is owned by land proprietors, and one-third by peasants. Of a population estimated at 140 millions, about half belong to the peasantry, and quite 20 millions to the agricultural labouring class employed by the land proprietors. The industrial population of the towns, including railway workers and miners, does not exceed 15 millions in number, that is to say, there are only about 3 million industrial workers throughout the whole of Russia.

And now as to the economic position of the working population. The peasants' conditions of existence are becoming more and more intolerable owing to their intense exploitation by

means of imperial and local taxes, direct and indirect, and to the keen competition of the large agriculturists in Russia and abroad. The only means of keeping the peasant in subjection is a sop of a little more land to increase the scope of his income. But this remedy is impossible for a length of time and applicable only sectionally with the aid of the aristocratic land proprietors, who run in fear of losing their lives should the peasantry rise in rebellion against them. The agricultural labourers working for the farm proprietors are gradually reduced in circumstances. Great numbers of them, having been thrown out of employment, migrate to the towns, and still more congest and overcrowd the industrial labour market, making the conditions of the industrial workers more and more deplorable. Competition is increased, the level of subsistence is lowered, and as very little new capital is being invested in industrial undertakings owing to the financial insecurity of aristocratic rule, the exploitation of all those producing is becoming unbearable. The largest proportion of the wealth exploited from the peasants, the agricultural labourers and the industrial workers finds its way into the pockets of the Ruler and his family, the aristocratic land proprietors, the bureaucracy, and the merchant princes. The smaller capitalists of the bourgeois class, denied the opportunity of exploiting labour without let or hindrance, owing to the privileges and powers of mediaeval origin possessed by the ruling class, make common cause with the workers, whom they induce, by means of the strike, to fight out the political battle of the capitalist bourgeoisie.

Now it must be borne in mind that although Feudalism was formally discarded in Russia in 1861, the social and juridical changes that have in every other country accompanied the economic revolution ushering in the capitalist system of unhampered competition were stubbornly withheld.

Capitalism without universal capitalist conditions in the social and juridical respect must naturally produce economic dilemma, and in Russia the thirty years of capitalist industrialism in an economic sphere nourished on the social and political soil of autocracy were bound to bring this pronounced contradiction to a head, an unhappy, disastrous war completing the chain of economic failure. Thus it is that we have on the one hand the peasants sucked completely dry by the ruthless taxation, the agricultural labourers despoiled to starvation level, many deprived of employment altogether owing to aggravated competition within the country and from abroad; the industrial workers collapsing under the super-human burden of oppression, over-work and starvation pay, more and more influenced by the growing number of unemployed agricultural labourers potting into the towns in search of work, and on the other hand ever more wealth accumulation on the part of the Autocrat and his henchmen, the archdukes, aristocrats, large land-owners, high officials, merchant princes, and big capitalists.

The disgusted and envious bourgeoisie comprising the manufacturers, merchants, and professionals in Law, Art, Science and Literature forced to stand by and see the wealth scooped in by their superiors in privilege, corruption and violence, raise an outcry for capitalist liberty and equality, and the revolutionary spirit seizing the enraged and oppressed working-class, they join the revolution in sheer despair, hoping to gain some amelioration by participating in the fight for a "free capitalist Russia."

The bourgeoisie by the aid of working-class strikes and demonstrations succeed in removing the terrible contradiction in the semi-capitalist system, a constitution is granted and all capitalists, small and great, and their hangers-on rejoice, for now at last will they be able to flourish in the enjoyment of free competition.

But for the working-class there is nothing but a return to wretchedness and the outlook of gloom and despair and unless indeed they have learned the lesson of reliance upon no other class but their own to effect that amelioration in their condition that they desire. So only will they attain to that class-consciousness with its appreciation of the universal solidarity of proletarian interests that shall presently deliver them and with them the whole human family from the throes of slavery for evermore.

H.N.

Is the Materialist Conception of History sufficient?

A continuation of the correspondence between two members of the S.P.G.B., the first portion of which appeared in the last number.

DEAR COMRADE,

The contribution to the discussion with which you have favoured me corroborates the position taken up by Comrade R. Kent in the article he contributed some months back now to THE SOCIALIST STANDARD with which I found myself in complete agreement. But in a discussion with a friend of mine on the aforesaid article, he saw fit to object that it is not possible for a man to look at the Social Problem as a man would look at a picture. And while I do not for one moment admit the impossibility of the attitude for which I have repeatedly argued, I am of opinion that to approach sociology in the same frame of mind as biology is and has been approached is, to say the least of it, difficult. The "furies of private interest" (unconscious as well as conscious), do undoubtedly act and act forcibly, and the question arises whether a man can get outside himself to look at such a question in the desired way. Is it possible to ignore the action of our individual promptings? In many cases the wish is unconsciously father to the thought. Some wise person has said that man does not know how anthropomorphic he is, and it seems to me he does not know how far he is influenced by his own wishes, etc.

But the point that I desire to raise is that while it is undoubtedly true that the ultimate explanation of any force or condition in Society is to be found in the means adopted by men to satisfy their material wants (I never objected to that), is it sufficient to explain their origin? When you have explained the origin of man's ideas as arising through economic and material channels, that does not explain the possible reaction of those intellectual forces on the economic and material conditions. We see that colonies, once the markets for an industrial and colonising country, themselves become industrial and enter the field, oftentimes in competition with the mother country herself; or the grown chick enters into competition with its own foster-bear and ultimately squeezes it out of existence. Is it sufficient to say that such a country developed her industry through the action of her functioning as a recipient of the commerce of the parent? Or is it necessary to take into consideration the reaction set up by that process? So with our social problem. Granting that the root of the whole lies in the economic development; granting that the change must primarily be economic, it still seems that to attain the desired economic revolution, it is first necessary to revolutionise men's ideas and men's conceptions. In other words change the existing intellectual conditions so as to change and improve the economic conditions, in order to make possible still further intellectual advancement.

Consider the Socialist propaganda. It is, in my opinion, one of the most necessary elements towards the revolution. Yet it has little direct economic significance. It is an appeal to the ethical and intellectual faculties of the audience, and until we have made the demand for Socialism, Socialism will not come. The creation of that demand is an intellectual, rather than an economic, process.

It may be that I am mistaken, but your illustration of the clay balls seems to leave something out, viz., the reaction of the balls on their environment. Without overlooking the differences that may exist in the hardness or the softness of the balls, which may be taken to correspond to the varying resistance offered by individuals to the pressure of the environment, it must not be lost sight of that this "resistance" is purely "passive," whereas the more or less conscious resistance of the individual to his environment is more active and has a modifying effect on the environment. To tell me that the intelligence of the individual which consciously resists its environment is the result of past economic conditions, helps me but little.

for I want to know how that intelligence can be so awakened as to be made to forcibly, actively, consciously, and definitely act on its immediate environment in order to alter it.

The same thing applies, of course, more or less, to biological as against sociological questions. In sociological questions you have to reckon with an intellectual consciousness that does not, so far as I know, obtain to the same extent in other scientific problems.

Yours fraternally,

To awaken that consciousness.

ENCLOSURE.

Comrade F. C. Watt's rejoinder will appear in the next issue.

CARNEGIE AND—CANT?

MR. ANDREW CARNEGIE, Crosses and Liberty vendor, has recently delivered himself of several lectures upon the horrors of War. Carnegie, the head of the great American Capitalist Corporation which raised an army in opposition to the steel-workers of Pittsburgh struggling to prevent a further hardening of their already hard enough conditions; Carnegie, the head of the mighty firm that conducted a bitter and bloody war to vindicate the right of Capital to wring out of the labour of the workers a larger and ever larger profit; Carnegie, the multi-millionaire, every penny of whose stupendous wealth is stained with the blood of his workmen, slaughtered by armed Pinkertons to make Carnegie's holiday and to help build him a reputation as a great philanthropist—this Carnegie comes to say:—"There still remains the foulest blot that ever disgraced the earth, the killing of civilised men by men like wild beasts as a permissible mode of settling international disputes, although, in Rousseau's words, 'War is the foulest fiend ever vomited forth from the mouth of hell.'"

So, "the foulest blot," when used to settle international disputes. And yet, in international wars, the contestants meet, not infrequently, on fairly level terms. Then, what sort of blot is it when one of the parties engaged in war is without arms, without food and with no means of effective retaliation, while the other is armed with the latest and surest implements of destruction, well victualled and protected? How Mr. Carnegie's righteous indignation would find expression in thunderous declamation at such a case. How he would—if he has not already done so—exhaust the descriptive possibilities of the most lurid adjectives in the English language, if it was an international war. And yet when it occurs at Homestead, the hell that sweats for Mr. Carnegie the millions that Mr. Carnegie's labour never produced, Mr. Carnegie expresses his horror in "loud silence!" It is wonderful the great difference a little change in the geographical situation of the seat of war will make.

If Mr. Carnegie thinks it his business, during the few moments that he can snatch from the arduous labours involved in the distribution of Free Libraries, to ventilate his views upon the horrors of war, let him at least be consistent and include *all* wars. It is not wisdom to select a particular war or class of wars to fulminate against. Such a course conveys an impression that *might* be unjust. If wars are dreadful, then the war between classes is dreadful, not less than the war between nations. The conflict between classes, between Capital and Labour—the industrial struggle—is indeed fought out on a far bloodier and a far wider field than any upon which the armies of nations ever fought. And the casualties are all on the Labour side. For Labour to-day is unarmed. Labour is dependent upon the enemy he is fighting for his food. He may not eat except by the leave of Capital. Capital commands every avenue of approach to the sources of wealth out of which Labour must win his sustenance. And no man traverses those avenues except by the pleasure and on the terms of Capital. And the terms are that Labour shall create wealth for Capital in return for just the sufficiency for the preservation of life. The difference between the total wealth produced and the amount consumed by Labour in maintaining his strength is the share

of Capital, a share that grows larger and larger as the possibilities of machinery increase, while the number of men required to produce the wealth for which there is effective demand, grows relatively smaller. And as Labour is displaced by the incessant demands of Capital for ever increased profits, he goes to join his fellows already struggling without against starvation and death to form the miserable reserve army clamouring for permission to work upon any terms, make for Capital an irresistible weapon of offence and defence. Incidentally, too, they form that pitiable mass of humanity into which the great-hearted philanthropist, overrunning with loving kindness and tender mercy for the distress that as a capitalist he has himself produced, ostentatiously pours his richly laden potent dribble of charity and the phantasies of a sybaritic Press.

And so the tale will run until Labour understands and translates his understanding into action. Fain would the philanthropist believe that that time will never come. But he may not. He knows and none better that the continued pressure of bitter adversity will not for much longer be held in check by the fortuitous distribution of blankets and coke tickets. And he knows that men exist who know the whole truth of the matter—the why of the misery and the how of the remedy—and who will show the poverty-stricken the way out.

There is a potent saying of one who hailed from the land that Mr. Carnegie has left, which runs thus:

You may fool all the people some of the time.

You may fool some of the people all the time.

But you can't fool all the people all the time.

Mr. Carnegie will have heard the saying before. It is rather old. But it is one of those sayings that are not of an age but for all time. We commend it again to Mr. Carnegie. It will be a good inscription for a prominent position in the hall in which Mr. Carnegie delivers his next address upon the foul blot of war as a method of settling international disputes. Unless before then Mr. Carnegie includes the class war in his denunciation and expresses and gives evidence of his determination to work for its abolition. But then its abolition involves the abolition of Mr. Carnegie, Millionaire.

It's an awkward situation! A.J.M.C.

TOTTENHAM BRANCH REPORT.

No report of this Branch has as yet appeared in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, but since the Branch was constituted on 28th December, 1904, a year's steady and determined propaganda has placed it among the strongest in the Party. During the summer three outdoor meetings were held every week and we even hope to continue the very successful Sunday meetings at "West Green Corner" throughout the winter. At this place where all the open-air political work of Tottenham is done we are the most firmly established of all the various Parties, and can easily sell more literature than all others combined.

The large amount of opposition given by representatives of every political faction in the country has greatly assisted us in making the Socialist position clear to the workers, and the sophistries and confusionist tactics of Liberal and Tory, Free Trader and Protectionist, of I.L.P. and S.D.F., of I.R.C. and N.D.F., of the Temperance men and Charity mongers, the Back-to-the-Lands and the Land Nationalizers, have been fully exposed to audiences of 200 to 600.

Our membership has so increased that we have been compelled to secure larger premises for our weekly business meetings, which are now held every Wednesday evening at 8 p.m. in the hall of the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern.

It is pleasing to be able to record such a gratifying result of our efforts, and our comrades in other parts may take it as an assurance that the workers of Tottenham will not lag behind but are ready and willing to take their place in the fight for, and capture of, The World for the Workers.

L. BAXBY.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

The Head Office of The Socialist Party of Great Britain is now situated at 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N., to which address all communications should be sent.

General correspondence should be addressed to "The General Secretary." Articles and correspondence submitted for insertion in *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD* should be addressed to "The Editorial Committee."

Subscriptions and advertisements for *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD*, and orders for pamphlets, book, etc., issued or sold by the Party, should be addressed to "The Publications Department."

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office on the first Saturday in each month, at 3 p.m., and on the third Tuesday in each month, at 7 p.m.

Terms of Subscriptions.

	£	s.	d.
Twelve Months	...	6	1

Scale of Charges for Advertisements.

	£	s.	d.
Per inch, One Insertion	...	0	2
Quarter Column do.	...	0	5
Half Column do.	...	0	10
One Column do.	...	1	0

Special arrangements will be made for Advertisements to be inserted in more than one issue.

The Socialist Standard.



SATURDAY, DEC. 2, 1905.

IMPOTENCE OR IMPUDENCE?

The working-class may well pray to be delivered from their friends, for those "friends" are evidently determined that, so far as it is possible for them to compass it, the working-class shall remain in that condition of mental darkness and confusion to which is traceable their present inertia and indifference to those prime and fundamental causes of proletarian misery upon which we who form The Socialist Party of Great Britain are endeavouring to focus their attention as the indispensable preliminary to that Social Revolution which alone can effect any material and lasting benefit for them. The month of November seems to have been particularly favourable to the production of astounding examples of muddled reasoning on the part of these "friends" who, because the working-class are largely ignorant, have been permitted to foist themselves into the position of leaders. Of themselves these exhibitions of fatuous baffleheadedness or calculated deception and treachery—whichever it is—would only invoke hilarity or contempt, but unfortunately their authors have secured a standing of considerable prominence, so that it becomes necessary for those who know the truth and who are earnestly desirous that the working-class should awaken to an appreciation of their powers and opportunities, to dissociate themselves as forcefully as possible from such utterances and actions, and to expose their impotence and impudence.

Consider the case of the women's deputation to Balfour, that event which recently attracted so much notice. These unhappy women of the working-class in their "loped and windowed" raggedness are prevailed upon to parade their pathetic poverty, not to be noted in menace, but in order that the pitiable pathos of their position may move the hearts of those who batten upon their misery and whose very existence is dependent upon the continuance of an impoverished proletariat. And these women are inspired to depute a number of their fellows to

wait upon a capitalist minister to beg that something be done for them lest they utterly perish. Yet the leaders of this deputation subsequently confess their full knowledge of the futility of such an appeal!

It is true that one at least of them has endeavoured to justify the action on the ground that otherwise the workers would not believe that nothing can be obtained from the capitalist class. But this same leader at the same time admits that he has headed similar deputations for 20 years! How many more years then will he be content to follow such methods? Surely he has sense enough to see that the working-class are hardly more alive to the fact he wishes to impress upon them than they ever were. And surely his knowledge is not so limited that he cannot understand that this continued ignorance is to some considerable extent due to the fact that he and his fellow misleaders have omitted to tell the whole truth in the past. Then by what name shall we call him if he is prepared to inflict still further pain and disappointment upon those whose misery is even now greater than they can bear?

If those who, knowing the truth, have failed to speak it; if those who should have educated the workers have occupied their time mainly in deluding them, it is small wonder if the ignorance is as great and the working-class conditions as bad as they have ever been. How many more years we ask will these leaders be content to play the game of the fool? Or is it that they are afraid of the consequences of telling the truth after having told other than the truth for so long?

It is small wonder, we repeat, that the working-class mind is muddled when we have, to take another horrible example, a member of the highly cultured middle class (as he describes himself) like Mr. Hyndman, who, while urging that Socialists should do all the harm they possibly can to Liberalism, affirms that Socialists are prepared to support Liberals in their efforts to put on the statute books certain reform measures which, in the next breath, Mr. Hyndman himself admits will not affect the working-class in whose interests he claims he is working. If this is an example of Mr. Hyndman's high culture, we can do without it, just as we can do without the logic of a Robert Blatchford, who, while rightly condemning the absurdity of the action of the unemployed leaders in arranging deputations which it is foreknown must be fruitless, argues that the thing to do is to ensure the return of a large number of labour members to the House of Commons at the next election. Mr. Blatchford knows quite well that the labour members already elected to the House of Commons are precisely the persons who are concerned with the arrangement of absurd deputations—men like Mr. W. Crooks, a rump Radical, who holds that because certain monied persons are contributing infinitesimal fractions of the wealth they have robbed the working-class of to relief funds for the unemployed, the rich and the poor are beginning to work hand-in-hand; or like Mr. Keir Hardie, who, while denying the existence of a class war and preaching for the mollification of the conscience of nonconformity, and for his own election to political position, the necessity of the gospel of love as the only method by which happiness may be ensured to all, argues in another connection and for another purpose, that the working-class must inspire the capitalist-class with fear, must compel them by sheer terrorism to let go their grip before they can hope to achieve their purpose.

These are some of the men and some of the influences we have to combat in order that the clear issue may be presented to the working-class to which we belong. And whatever epithet

of opprobrium these men or others may coin to belittle our efforts and to retard the spread of our views, we shall persist with our propaganda by all the means at our disposal, in the full confidence that ultimately our class must adopt our attitude if they would work out their own emancipation from the thralldom imposed by capitalist and landlord domination.

THE CLARION VANNER & THE TRUTH.

When the "Clarion Vanner" was in the neighbourhood of Paddington, the speaker, E. R. Hartley, was asked whether it was true that Keir Hardie accepted the class-struggle when in Amsterdam in order to gain admission to the International Socialist Congress, and immediately denied the existence of that struggle upon his return to this country.

Hartley replied that it was not true. Our readers may judge of his ignorance or dishonesty from the following facts.

The resolutions agreed to at the Brussels Conference of 1899, which complete the conditions of admission to the International Socialist Congress as adopted at the London Congress, are as follow:

Are admitted (1) "All associations which adhere to the essential principles of Socialism: socialisation of the means of production and exchange; union and international action of the workers; Socialist conquest of political power by the proletariat organised in a class party."

(2) "All corporate organisations which, placing themselves on the ground of the class-struggle and acknowledging the necessity of political action (legislative and Parliamentary) which do not, however, participate directly in the political movement."

Keir Hardie's renunciation of the basic principle of modern Socialism—the class-struggle—on his return to the country in which a Liberal capitalist pays part of his election expenses, shows him to be playing a double game; for he acquiesces in the class-struggle only in order to pass muster with the international proletariat.

Will Hartley apologise?

THE RIGHT TO WORK.

The very latest is a "Right to Work Committee" upon which a number of middle-class persons and some who have discovered that labour "leading" is more easy and profitable than work have elected themselves. The "right" they clamour for is not for themselves but for others. They "appeal" to the working-class to "demand" from the dominant class more work, when already too much is performed. They would perpetuate the capitalist system by shewing the wealthy shirkers how they may stave off the day of reckoning and save their skins for awhile if they will accept their proposals and make work. For our part we say To Hell with the "Right to Work; we claim our Right to Live and to live right well. Let us scorn these middle class decoy ducks and organise to bring about the common ownership of the means of life, which alone will enable us to secure the only Right we are concerned about. Then and not till then shall we recognise our obligation to perform our share of the necessary work. In the meantime, our Right to work is the Right of the wealthy idlers to organise our labour as their wage slaves. The "demand" for that Right we will leave to the agents of the capitalists, whether in the guise of middle class sympathisers or well paid labour "leaders."

Back numbers of *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD* can be had through any Branch Secretary.

THE PLAINT OF THE PALLIATOR.

A FERNÉ resident in Watford has written me calling my attention to an article by Mr. H. W. Lee (whose name was recently brought into some prominence in connection with the Cambridge affair), and suggesting that I offer an opinion upon it. It seems to have had some discussion with another local gentleman who thought, in opposition to my correspondent, that the proposals made in the article should be adopted by a Socialist Party, and that the reasons given were satisfactory and convincing. I should have preferred that an able pen than mine dealt with the matter, but as it is one that strikes me as not over difficult for any professor of Socialism with a moderately efficient knowledge behind the Socialism he professes, to handle, I gladly avail myself of the opportunity of contributing something that may help those who are anxious to occupy a right and logical position to that end.

Mr. Lee's article is briefly an argument for Socialist concentration upon two palliative (?) proposals which he names. He says, "The question I wish to bring under the notice of English Socialists... is whether the time has not arrived when they should formulate a vigorous demand for some or all of the political measures I have indicated" (he only indicates two, viz., Payment of Members and Election Expenses, and the Second Ballot "with a view of using them to the advantage of Socialist candidates." He adds, rather naively, "Twenty years ago that kind of political agitation might have been safely left to the Radicals of that day." Well, as a Socialist resident in England, I thank Mr. Lee for bringing this question under my notice, but after due deliberation I must regretfully say that I have come to the conclusion that I don't think much of his proposals. But then my outlook appears to differ from Mr. Lee's in a very essential particular.

Unlike Mr. Lee, who, it seems, is quite ready, and even anxious, that his candidate should be returned to political office by a class unconscious vote if need be,—to use his own words, "as the lesser of the two evils at the second ballot,"—I am only concerned with success at the poll for my candidate upon clearly defined lines and by a class-conscious working-class vote. Because I know, and I should be surprised indeed if Mr. Lee did not know also, that no real contribution can be made to the solution of the poverty problem unless the men who have taken possession of the machinery of government have done so in the interests and under the instruction of the working-class intelligently organised upon the basis of their class interests. In other words, the elected person must go to his duties as their delegate, not as their director. The emancipation of the working-class must be the work of the workers themselves, and he who thinks by coercion or cajolery to hustle them along a road down which they cannot see is, if he is honest, voluntarily stretching himself upon a rack that will lacerate him painfully before he is free of it.

Of course the argument is that

THE POSSESSION OF PUBLIC OFFICE.

enables the occupant to educate the more effectively. But in that case the course to pursue would be to whittle the candidate's programme down as near as possible to nothingness in order that no question might arise in the minds of the untutored electorate to give them pause in their blind or semi-blind voting. That would surely be the most effectual method of procedure assuming the honesty of the candidate could be relied upon—although Mr. Lee would be hard put to it to create a confidence in the honesty of an elected person who as candidate was guilty of most culpable dishonesty. Mr. Lee, I take it, would not urge such a course, although his suggestion amounts to the same thing. He argues that the political activity of the Socialist Party should be concentrated upon two specified political reforms. Which means that these two are to be brought out in bold relief while all other proposals are to be set well away in the

background. For the time being the Socialist is to take his stand practically on the same ground that any Radical occupies. Any number of Radicals or Liberals I never did know when the Liberal left off and the Radical began will agree that Socialism is a good thing, but as practical politicians, seeing that Socialism is without the range of possibility until at least certain political reforms of the type of Payment of Members, and Second Ballot, have been achieved, they think the best course is to concentrate upon that achievement, which it seems to me, is Mr. Lee's position, only he will probably protest that his Socialism is not so far in the background as the Radical's—a difference of small moment, seeing that both Mr. Lee and the Radical are agreed that

SOCIALISM SHALL BE IN THE BACKGROUND.

anyhow, and that the foreground shall be occupied by one or two or a dozen reforms.

That being so, the question immediately arises as to whether any present need for a Socialist organisation exists at all. If Socialism is not possible unless and until these reforms have been attained, and if to attain them Socialism is to be obscured, as it must be, why waste strength in a separate organisation? Why not unite in one great and powerful Radical faction, and with the strength that comes of unity, strike the blow that shall shiver the barriers erected by Reaction (with a capital R) between the forces of progress and their political objective. Or something like that. If the immediate necessity for the propagation of the principles of Socialism is conceded for the prosecution of a vigorous agitation on behalf of these reforms, then the necessity for the propagation of the principles of Socialism retreats to a secondary position and the necessity for the present existence of a Socialist party retreats with it.

To me there seems no escape from this conclusion. Mr. Lee will protest that for the Socialist, Socialism does not retreat—that it is in the first position all the time. Which is quite true. But then a Socialist would not advocate the concentration that Mr. Lee advocates upon

A COUPLE OF PALLIATIVE (?) MEASURES.

the realisation of which will not necessarily land us a step nearer Socialism. The point in this connection and it is a point that Mr. Lee and those who think with him are concerned to labour at other times—is that palliatives are only of utility when they are achieved by a working-class consciously organised as such. How often has Mr. Lee and his friends pressed the objection with unanswerable force that the whole New-castle programme—which included Payment of Members by the way—can be granted by a capitalist state without endangering itself, and as a matter of fact has been so granted? Then why this *Vote Free?* Is there any special virtue in Payment of Members or Second Ballot? Under present conditions there is no advantage to the Socialist in the Second Ballot, and Payment of Members cannot be regarded as anything like an unmixed blessing. Certainly neither of them nor both, even from their best aspects, can compare in importance with the propagation of Socialism.

It is famous for Mr. Lee to suggest that while Socialists are concentrating upon these two palliatives they are at the same time maintaining Socialism in its pre-eminent position as

THE REAL AND SOLE OBJECTIVE.

You cannot concentrate upon something short of, and not necessarily genuine to, your real objective and at the same time concentrate upon that objective itself. Besides, Mr. Lee has himself urged as a strong reason—as a fact it is his strongest reason—for the adoption of his method, that a large number of Radicals and what not, who are opposed to Socialism itself, would support an agitation for the palliatives. They are opposed to Socialism but yet will work for your palliatives—why? Because, largely, they do not understand Socialism. The Socialist is concerned that they shall understand Socialism. And how shall the Socialist affect his purpose by putting his Socialism behind his back and going down to the position of the anti-Socialist retreating twenty years in order to take up the agitation that Radicalism of that day dropped? And this at the same time that Mr. Lee and his friends are pointing to the countries where the proposals it is suggested should be

agitated for, have been realised without any effect at all upon working-class conditions and I will assert, without perceptible effect upon the local Socialist movement. Mr. Lee must go back if he will, but he will not take one Socialist back with him. The Socialist will stay to show

THE UTILITY OF RADICAL AGITATION.

to prove to the Radical how deplorably unproductive must be any effort not directed toward the attainment of the only thing that matters—Socialism.

Repeat again—it cannot be too often repeated—that there is no point in securing palliative measures apart from the manufacture of Socialist opinion that alone can use them. And this Socialist opinion must be manufactured *fast*. And it will only be manufactured by Socialists who, refusing to go back twenty years or one year to the propagation of reforms, persist in the heavy educational spade work that still requires to be done. For Mr. Lee to suggest as he does, that the time is now ripe for Socialists to secure some reward, meaningless for the work they have done in the past, is simply to proclaim that they are tired of the work that still remains to be done. There is no reward for the Socialist except the satisfaction that comes of the knowledge that he has faithfully discharged the duty laid upon him and by which alone he justifies his existence. Administrative power will come presently, when an electorate of enlightened producers moulded to class-consciousness by the work of the Socialist educationalists who have emphasised

THE PROPORT OF ECONOMIC CHANGE.

and insisted upon the re-organisation of industry upon the basis of common ownership in the means of life as the *only* antidote to the hardship and suffering such economic change involves for the wealth producers—when this class-conscious electorate shall have translated their appreciation of their distinctive class interests into logical political action. The power will come as a *result* of working-class enlightenment, and it will be working-class power, therefore, not the power of persons elected upon a class-unconscious—that is, an ignorant working-class vote.

I hope that is fairly clear. It is working-class power the Socialist wants to increase. And no working-class power is possible outside working-class enlightenment. And the Socialist propagandist is one of the important factors in that effort towards enlightenment—the Socialist propagandist, the propagandist, that is, of revolution, as distinguished from the palliative propagandist, the propagandist of reform. The only justification for the Socialist's existence therefore is

THE PROPAGATION OF REVOLUTION.

As to whether better educational work could be done by a person who, having shed the Socialist coat to secure election, or who, having been elected upon some issue other than Socialism, dons his coat again or renews his Socialism after election, is a question that to me can only be answered in the negative. A Socialist can do as an elected person, exceedingly little. Certainly he can do nothing that will have any material effect upon working-class conditions. His election must have been secured upon this understanding if he is to maintain the following that he has created. That is to say he must have been elected as a Socialist if he wishes to keep the adherents to his views as numerically high as they were at the moment of his election. Because, otherwise he will have been elected by persons who will look to him to realise certain reforms—a possibility only when a majority of Radical representatives favourable to those reforms have been elected—sufficiently large in order to start with, because those reforms are in one way or another to benefit them the persons electing him. But as I have said, Mr. Lee and his supporters are at times quite ready to deny that reforms can make any appreciable difference to working-class conditions, and I am able to point in evidence to concrete cases where, in practice, those reforms have so failed, and as it is mainly upon

A WORKING-CLASS VOTE.

that any person is elected, it follows that Mr. Lee's Socialist Councillor or whatever he may be, will hardly realise his not gas in the first place, and in any event will be unable to show

NEMESIS!

The Municipal Elections are doubtless dealt with elsewhere. I am not therefore concerned here with their results generally, but an incident arising out of the Burnley contest merits, I think, a special word.

Burnley is a town where the S.D.F. claims a considerable following. It is regarded somewhat in the light of an S.D.F. stronghold, as S.D.F. strongholds go. And Mr. Daniel Irving is the strong man of this S.D.F. stronghold, as S.D.F. strong men go. He has sat on the Board of Guardians; on the School Board; on the Town Council. He is therefore a prominent citizen and in the past has doubtless worked strenuously for working-class interests according to his lights.

Yet he has failed to retain his seat on the Town Council. In the recent elections he was defeated. The S.D.F. strong man of the S.D.F. stronghold has failed to maintain his position. Mr. Councillor Irving of yesterday is Mr. Ex-Councillor Irving of to-day.

This is remarkable. It seems to require some explanation.

The S.D.F. appear to recognise the importance of the catastrophe. One of their captains has fallen, and he has fallen on a most unlikely field. He has been vanquished in his own ward. In the ward that would know him best.

Why is this? Is it because the ward knows him best that he has been defeated? Or what?

The S.D.F. sees the difficulty and Mr. Hyndman, their leader, writes to the Press to explain.

This is the explanation of Mr. Hyndman: Mr. Irving has been defeated by a "dirty dodge" of the Burnley Liberals. The Liberals knew they would be defeated—these loathsome Liberals. And so they entered into a binding compact with the Tories. Together they defeated Irving. And Mr. Hyndman says that the moral is "Let Socialists do Liberals all the harm they possibly can on every occasion."

Now I do not know how other Socialists regard this explanation, but to me it reads uncommonly like—may I say?—drivel. Drivel seems the only word. And Mr. Hyndman ought to know better. Because no one has insisted more often than he that Liberals and Tories are equally the enemies of the Socialist; that they are equally the enemies of the working-class because they both represent capitalist interests. Mr. Irving has said the same thing. Innumerable times. And of course it is true.

That being so, why talk of a "dirty dodge"? Why is it a dirty dodge? Why is it a dodge at all? What is more natural than that representatives of the same interest should work together?

Besides, Mr. Hyndman says that all Mr. Irving required was a straight fight with the enemy. Well, hasn't he had a straight fight? If not why not? Will Mr. Hyndman please be clear.

Or is the suggestion that it was not a straight fight because Mr. Irving expected the Tories to support him? Did he? If so, what is the matter with Mr. Irving's Socialism? Did Mr. Hyndman expect it? If so, he must be as devoid of political aptitude as he alleged the S.D.F. were. If not, why the wail about "dirty dodges"?

Mr. Hyndman's explanation requires explaining. I suggest he can do better than this if he will. He really need not be so thin. He knows something of the local position. He is himself Parliamentary candidate for Burnley and should know. He is a prominent member of the S.D.F. which is another reason why he should know. Unless he don't want to know.

He should know that there are compacts other than those between Liberals and Tories in Burnley. Really *dirty* compacts. Compacts between Socialists (or men masquerading as such) and Liberals. He should know because he has himself been a party to such a compact!

Has he forgotten the compact entered into with the official Liberal candidate as a result of which his (Hyndman's) candidature was withdrawn in favour of the Liberal? Was this a *clean* compact?

Again, has Mr. Hyndman never heard of the dissatisfaction (to use mild words) caused by the Irving tactics in connection with the Burnley School Board elections of a few years ago? Has he never heard of an arrangement or compact

being made with the Progressives (read Liberals) on that occasion? And has he never heard of the more recent arrangement that found expression in the joint candidature of Irving and a crowd of pseudo-labour men on a joint programme constructed to meet the requirements of the least progressive (read most reactionary) of the crowd?

If he has heard; if he does not forget I mean to say, his explanation is drivel and I fear somewhat dishonest drivel at that. If he has not heard, or if he does forget he should be less hasty with his explanations and more ready to first of all make sure of his ground.

I put it to Mr. Hyndman that no man can claim to represent working-class interests who coquettes with the representatives (conscious or otherwise) of anti-working-class interests. But, indeed, that is unnecessary because Mr. Hyndman admits it.

I put it to him that only a Socialist can represent working-class interests. If he does not agree, why does he represent himself a Socialist? And why does he urge Socialist candidatures against what are called Labour-Progressive candidatures? If he does agree he will admit that no tactician or coquette such as Mr. Irving has been can hope to build up a working-class party consciously organised on distinctive class lines.

He will concede that by such methods only confusion can be wrought in working-class minds. And he will agree that a confused working-class mind will translate itself into political action opposed to working-class interests—by the return of Liberals and Tories to political power against the Socialist.

That being so I suggest to Mr. Hyndman that Mr. Irving was defeated because he should never have been selected. That is to say his previous election was secured by votes which were not given by conscious working-class voters—he was not elected as a Socialist but upon some subsidiary issue. Or if he *was* elected by class-conscious voters he has dissatisfied them—which indeed is not surprising—by his methods since. They have rejected him because his Socialism is not satisfactory.

In the first place it is clear the Socialist position was not adequately defined at the election; Or, which amounts to the same thing, that the subsidiary issue predominated over the Socialist issue. Which means that the educational work which should have preceded the election was not adequately performed. In the second case the occasion is one not for a white-washing but for a condemnation.

I commend the choice to Mr. Hyndman's consideration. And I think upon reflection he will admit that the whole ground is fairly covered by the one word I have set at the head of this article—Nemesis!

A. JAMES.

THE ORIGIN OF PRIVATE PROPERTY IN LAND.

How did possession of land become individualised? There can be little doubt as to the general nature of the answer. Force in one form or the other is the sole cause adequate to make the members of a society yield up their combined claims to the area they inhabit. Such force may be that of an external aggressor, but in either case it implies militant activity.

It seems possible that the primitive ownership of land by the community, which, with the development of coercive institutions lapsed in large measure or wholly into private ownership, will be revived as industrialism further develops. In legal theory landowners are directly or indirectly tenants of the Crown (which in our day is equivalent to the State, or, in other words, the community). The community from time to time resumes possession after making due compensation. Perhaps the right of the community to the land thus tacitly asserted will in time come overtly asserted and acted upon, after making full allowance for the accumulated value artificially given.

H. SPENCER.

Amongst the first members of the National Liberal Club to subscribe to Reynold's Sandwichmen's Fund were Mr. J. F. Green and Mr. E. Belfort Rax.

AN INTERESTING LITTLE EXPERIENCE.

THE S.P.G.B. BRIGADE.

I ENTERED the short, dark passage, writes "The Inquisitive Visitor" in the "Hford Guardian", and after bending slightly to the right it brought me to a door. Giving quite a whisper "rap," the door was opened immediately, and I faced a well-lighted room and a group of half-a-dozen tell-tale soft "Trilby" hats. The hats were eloquent indications of the thinking material they held, and were worn with a freedom of pose that only belongs to Bohemia, and the atmosphere of this particular Club.

Having so far broken the ice, so to speak, I realised that I was in the company of a jolly lot of boys, to use a free and easy phrase that sufficiently illustrates their attitude. The one who was sprawling full length on a table, with his elbows planted down to form a prop for his chin, threw off his soft brown hat as the long thin journalist, with one foot on another table and the other leg curled somewhere round his chair, cried "Chapeau bas!" They doffed their hats, and shook hands; thus, with a friendly instinct which ran as warm as the comfortable atmosphere of the room, I was introduced.

"Welcome to our lecture hall, and let the light of your knowledge grow," said he of the dark curly hair.

"Riddles worry me," I said, "and where is your lecture hall?"

He slid off the table and quoted Pan Leno, who had a handsome suite of one room, and simply turned round in his kitchen to find himself in his parlour!

How they talked and laughed! How they chased the wit from tongue to tongue, and played upon each other's idiosyncrasies with epigrammatic snaps of fully-licensed good fellowship! Socialists probably, and no doubt all admirers of G. Bernard Shaw, as well.

"In the name of Burger, Marx, and men, who are you?" I asked.

"We are the S.P.G.B.," said one, with the twinkling merriment of mystery.

"It sounds very much like the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel," I said, trying to be pleasant.

"So it is, the Gospel of Freedom, the great war of the world!"

"Drop the parish pump, please, and don't think that eye-book maxims will save time. What is your Gospel?"

"It would weary you to tell. Imagine a pure society in which every man may have his due, and then fix up the general outline of our efforts to secure it," he replied.

I settled down to enjoy the company of these young fellows, and wondered how long I should have to sustain it before it would bore me. For the nonce it was delightful, bright and gentlemanly, of courtesy mixed with the freedom that generally comes with long acquaintance.

I joined in a hand at whist and all the cards came my way. My partner was a gentleman who has been heard to address a Broadway crowd, and with two games we won the rubber. At another table two gentlemen were playing chess, one or two others came and looked on, a quiet feeling of good-fellowship reigning.

Then I pursued my inquisitive investigations. The "S.P.G.B." Club was open to members of The Socialist Party of Great Britain residing in the Roulford division as you will have guessed by now. There are discussion classes on alternate Tuesdays, to which the public are invited, and every Monday there is an Esperanto class.

"Willò yonò tello meso oughto olo thiso classo?" I asked.

The gentleman who conducts it made answer in a tongue which my petard refused to respond to.

So we sat on and chatted on many subjects. "Ships and shops and seedling wax, and cabbages and Kings," like the Walrus, until the relentless hands of the clock demanded that a pleasant evening should close with a lullaby. "Good-night!"

I had almost forgotten to say that the Club is situated in York Road, Hford.

E. J. B. ARDEN.

THE "CO-OPERATIVE" CURE.

As the "pure and simple" unions have had rather a bad time lately, owing to the large number of members seriously depleting their funds through unemployment, certain of their members have considered the unemployed problem, and found a "cure" for it. It is not "back to the land," "reafforestation," nor yet "reclaiming the foreshores," but it is the brand new "co-operative cure" *a la Crooks*. Seeing the large sums the unions have spent in unemployed benefits, and the still larger sums that would be jeopardised were they to strike, they have come to the conclusion that if all these sums of the various unions were pooled, they would have sufficient money to start a co-operative concern and employ the unemployed workers, and so solve the unemployed problem.

This sounds very well in theory, but its proposer seems to have forgotten that they are living under the capitalist system, and that no matter how they may attempt it, they cannot evade the conditions that control that system. The capitalist method of production demands that a profit must be made out of the product of labour. As the amount of wealth in all capitalist countries is continually growing, it is obvious that there is an increasing sum waiting to find a reproductive outlet, *i.e.*, a constantly growing amount of wealth in the hands of the capitalist-class, available for profitable investment.

With these facts in mind, let us examine the "co-operative cure." Let us suppose, for example, that the Operative Bricklayers' Society decide to start a co-operative building concern. In the first place there would have to be a quick return on the money or the unemployed bricklayers would not benefit much. That is to say, they would have to find a piece of land that was situated where there was actually, or soon would be, a demand for housing accommodation. Here in the open market they would be subjected to a severe competition with the speculative builders at once. But supposing them to have secured the land in the face of competition, and to have proceeded with the erection of their houses. Within the London district such firms as Patman and Fotheringham, or Lavett, could buy land and erect houses cheaper and quicker than the union could. Their houses would be ready to let sooner, and unless the demand was very large indeed, the union co-operative concern would not stand at all.

The same difficulty would present itself in any other trade along these lines. If the unions had their co-operative concerns running, and began to seriously compete with the capitalists, it would only be necessary for the large capitalists to flood the market at cutting rates, and prices would soon be depressed below the level at which the union could work, and the scheme would be killed. The co-operative slate quarries which were started by Lord Penrhyn's lacked out men have practically reached this point. They may pick up the crumbs of commerce, like the non-trust firms of the United States, but as soon as they get troublesome they have to go.

If the case of the ordinary co-operative society (which is simply a kind of joint-stock company) is taken it will be found that in a large number of cases prices are higher than the usual shop prices. As more and more machinery is introduced, and the army of the unemployed is increased, the wages of those in work fall. The worker has a still smaller purchasing power, and has to buy goods, knowing them to be inferior, because he cannot afford any other, even though the co-op. charges were but a little higher than those of the outside dealer. There has been no great improvement in the workers' condition through co-operative concerns in any country where capitalism is well advanced to the trust stage. The only concerns that have paid well are those run on approved capitalist lines, sweating and violation of the Tenck Act included. The workers cannot fight capital with capital, because the larger capital is bound to win, and the workers do not control it. The Socialist Commonwealth is the only cure for the unemployed problem. Help us then to realise it.

E. J. B. ARDEN.

CLASS-CONSCIOUSNESS.

Class-consciousness is a term widely quoted and almost equally widely misunderstood. A thorough knowledge of all that it implies is essential if we want to understand why our Declaration of Principles lays it down that we are absolutely opposed to all other political parties. We are in opposition because they are not class-conscious. They do not recognise the existence of the class struggle, the social war in which we all, willy-nilly, are engaged. Many of their actions, professedly designed to benefit the working class, have as a matter of fact, a directly opposite effect. We have so-called Socialist parties in existence whose programme no Radical would hesitate to endorse. The palliatives which they put forward as necessary steps in the evolution of the Socialism that is "coming as a thief in the night," have in a number of cases, already a place on the statute books of capitalist governments. Where is it found that they have been of appreciable benefit to the working class? An instance has yet to be found. And yet these parties continue to chase their immaterial Will-o-the-Wisps, leaving the question of the emancipation of their class untouched, which, after all, is but natural. They are not class-conscious, and until they are the chances are all in favour of their being on the wrong road rather than the right.

This is seen more clearly when specific instances are taken, instances which afford much food for reflection. If it were not so indicative of pitiable ignorance, what could be more amusing than the exhibition of class-unconsciousness presented by the engineers, when they voted for the political return of their employer whilst they were at the same time engaged in an industrial battle with him. Tired of him as a sergeant, they made him a field-marshal, putting him in charge of the police, the military, and all other clubs that are used to batter in the heads of the reading and working men.

The S.P. openly deny the class struggle. Of course, they are willing to modify this view when they wish for representation at the Amsterdam Congress. But ordinarily they designate the man who preaches the class war as visionary, firebrand, disrupter, etc. Their conduct is a fairly plain guide as to how far they are class-conscious. In Willesden at the present time they are pointing out the advantages of extended municipal control. Curiously enough the municipal employees do not appear to be enthusiastic over the advantages. They turn out in a miserable drizzle to demonstrate with band and banner for a living wage.

The S.D.F. is a body admitting the class struggle in word but repudiating it in act. How the party with such a record of intrigue and compromise can reconcile their action with the class-war doctrine at first sight appears incomprehensible. It can only be explained on the ground that they have no clear conception of what the class struggle is, or that they are prepared to deliberately sell working-class interests.

No class-unconscious party can be representative of the interests of the working class. The capitalist class is essentially class-conscious. They recognise that their position as rulers is purely relative to and dependent upon the existence of a class subservient to them. Just so soon as the workers realise that they are the subservient class, that they are the producers of the substance which is greedily grabbed by the parasitic shirkers who rule them, just so soon shall we begin to see things. The great are great to us because we are on our knees. Let us therefore rise. We call upon every man who is conscious that the working class and the capitalist class have interests mutually antagonistic, to join The Socialist Party of Great Britain, to drop his shackles and stand erect. Mr. Balfour has just shown how to be class-conscious. "We can do nothing for you," he says, and he is quite right. The only surprising thing about the utterance is that the meaning is so clear. It makes the alternative equally clear. Workers of England, don't plaintively appeal to the enemy for assistance. Don't ask them if they would be so good as to stop plundering you for a time. You have their answer, "we can do nothing for you." Organise in a class-conscious party. The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and do something for yourselves.

W. E. HENRY.

appreciable effect as the result of those reforms. Wherefore his following will tail off until it is reduced to but little more than the converted nucleus with which he set out, and who would have expected the more or less barren results that the elected person would have to show. This is not hypothetical at all. The record of a thousand cases will bear the conclusion out. The whole history of reform movements can be called up in evidence. The latter end of every reform agitation presents the unhappy spectacle of great bodies of tired, dispirited men and women whose discontent, that once had urged them so insistently to action, has turned to apathy in the wreck of their high hopes.

Mr. Lee cannot deny this without at the same time undermining the whole ground for the existence of Socialist organisation. And yet he would have us go back to the position of Reformers of 20 years ago and he talks of the advantages of the Second Ballot in which Socialists might stand a chance of election as, to use his own expression, "the lesser of the two evils."

Which, I mean to say, is,

VERY SHORT-SIGHTED AND VERY SILLY.

Does Mr. Lee deny that the working-class have at the present moment sufficient political power to do what they like? Then why all this blethering for more political power? The only question which concerns the Socialist is why the working-class should not like Socialism and why they do not return Socialists to power. And the only answer to that of course is, working-class ignorance. Very good. Let Mr. Lee, if he is a Socialist, start in, to dispel the ignorance and not waste so much time and energy in pressing for more political power when it is not wanted. The worst of these young men in a hurry is that they will be forever attempting to take short cuts to the Social Revolution against the advice of maturer and more reflective minds. There are no short cuts. There is only a long, straight line. If that's too monotonous for Mr. Lee to follow he must, until he is tired of it, keep up his pleasant little game of running round in a circle. But he must not expect Socialists to run round after him; they have more important work to do.

ALB. J. M. GRAY.

HOW LONG?

How long will the parsons lie.

Who, smiling and smirking, tell of a "beautiful land on high?"

For the vile who oppress and cry,

"O, Lord! I believe!" and yell

To the unbelievers who dwell

In goodness fierce threats of hell?

How long will the parsons lie?

How long will the rulers lie.

Who, double-faced, aye delight

To trade on a cheap-drawn sigh

For the poor, but are ever nigh

To work out the rich man's spite

And crush, with tyrannic might,

All freedom and truth and right?

How long will the rulers lie?

How long will the rich men lie.

And claim as their own the land—

The land that the poor live by

And all things beneath the sky;

The toil of the worker's hand,

The lives of the hunger-banned?

How long shall their false claim stand?

How long will the rich men lie?

How long will the People lie.

In abject and crouching woe

At the feet of the men on high,

Who are only men, and can die?

How long will they vainly cry?

How long ere their rights they know?

How long till they sweep the sky

With Freedom's flag, and dethrone

The forces of Tyranny?

How long ere they boldly go

To Slavery's overthrow?

How long will the reckoning grow?

How long will the people lie?

Bulletin.

PARTY NOTES.

It is particularly requested that all communications be addressed: "The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N." See official notice on page 4.

I find it necessary to repeat the above request, as some Branch officials and other correspondents are still sending communications to other addresses than the Head Office.

It was stated in these notes in our September issue that Peckham Branch were arranging a debate between Mr. Stephenson, Treasurer of the L.R.C., and a representative of this Party. Apparently the debate, like a well-known smile, "won't come off," but thro' no fault of ours.

Our Comrade Wren recently explained the matter in the "Dulwich Post," from which the following is quoted:

"We submitted to Mr. Stephenson, complying with his request for particulars, the following proposal: 'That he should meet John Kent, of the S.P.G.B., in debate at the Peckham Public Hall on any week-night in September, he (Mr. Stephenson) might choose; the chair to be occupied by Mr. Chas. Hawkins, of the French Polishers' Union. (Mr. Hawkins is opposed to us, but we could rely on his strict impartiality). That the expense for the hire of the hall should be borne equally by the two parties, or wholly by The Socialist Party.'"

Upon publication of Cde. Wren's letter, Mr. Stephenson wrote to the "Dulwich Post" a long communication of a red-herring brand, by which, apparently, he declines to meet our speaker because the Peckham Branch "refused to guarantee" that he would have a fair hearing!!!

Now, so far as we are concerned, all our opponents may rest assured that no efforts on our part will be spared to provide them with a quiet and attentive audience, but as the "first statesman in the land" has remarked, "there is a limit to human endurance." Is it that Mr. Stephenson fears that his case is so weak, and his method of presenting it would be so bad that the audience would lose their patience with him for wasting their time?

In accordance with Rule 6, no member shall be placed on the official lecture list until he has satisfactorily answered a list of questions drawn up by the Executive Committee. A copy of these questions will be forwarded to any member applying for same. Each Branch should make a point of organising classes for their study, so that we may give an even better account of ourselves next season than this.

Comrades who may be feeling a bit "down" should make an effort to attend the Sunday evening lectures at Dovecote Hall, Wood Green, held under the auspices of the North London District Council. The hall is well lighted and cosy furnished and the local comrades are hearty in their welcome; questions are plentiful and the discussion good. On the 31st of December a Social Evening will be held.

Members who get possession of reports or other documents issued by Trade Unions, Reform Parties, and the like, are kindly requested to forward them to the Head Office, in order that Powder and Shot may be extracted from them for the use of our speakers and writers.

G. C. H. CARTER, Gen. Sec.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

CATHERINE FITZGERALD.—Letter received as we go to press. We note your protest against the branch reports being used to enlorge individual members of the Party.

I.C.R. (Soham).—Will deal with your question in the next issue.

Printed by JACOMB BROS., 24 Wingfield Road, Stratford E., for the Proprietors, The Socialist Party of Great Britain, and published by G. C. H. CARTER, 1A, Caledonian Rd., London, N.

S.P.G.B.

North London District Council.

LECTURES FOR DECEMBER.

: DOVECOTE HALL, :
78, High Road, Wood Green, at 7.30.

At the time of going to press the North London District Council's Lecture List has not come to hand, but we understand that Lectures will be given on Sunday Evenings as usual.

S. P. G. B.
BATTERSEA BRANCH.

SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES

WILL BE GIVEN AT
SYDNEY HALL
36, YORK ROAD, BATTERSEA,

AS UNDER—
Dec. 3rd—T. A. JACKSON:

"Socialism and Respectability."
.. 10th .. To be announced.

.. 17th—E. J. B. ALLEN:
"Socialism and The Trade Union Movement."

.. 24th—R. H. KENT:
"Human Possibilities."

Chair at 7.30 sharp. Discussion.
ADMISSION FREE.

ECONOMIC CLASSES

Will be held Sundays December 3rd and 17th.

Instructor — J. FITZGERALD.

S.P.G.B. LIBRARY, No. 1.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF
GREAT BRITAIN,

Containing, in full detail, a statement of the
Principles, Policy, & Rules
OF THE PARTY.

Post free, 1 copy 1jd.; 6 copies 5d.; 12 copies 9d.
Special terms for larger quantities. Orders and remittances should be forwarded to the Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

VOL. I.

OF

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

Well bound in stiff boards.

Post Free 3s. 0d.

Orders, accompanied by remittance, should be sent to Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N.

Branch Secretaries and others

SHOULD NOTE THAT

JACOMB BROS.

Can do their printing as Cheaply and as
well as anyone else.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

HEAD OFFICE

1A, CALEDONIAN RD., KING'S CROSS, LONDON, N.
General Secretary — G. C. H. CARTER

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA—A. Jones, Secretary, 3, Moberg St., Latchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m. at Sydney Hall, York Road, Battersea, S.W.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Executive Committee. Applications should be sent to the General Secretary.

CLERKENWELL—J. Fitzgerald, Sec., 24, Wilmington Square, W.C. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Sunday in each month at 3 p.m. at 24, Wilmington Square, W.C.

EAST HAM—G. Wilson, Sec., 14, Coleridge Avenue, Manor Park, E. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 at above address.

EDMONTON—R. Kenny, Secretary. Business meetings at 24, Belmont Avenue, Lower Edmonton, every Friday at 8 p.m.

FULHAM—E. J. B. Allen, Secretary, 306, North End Road, Fulham, S.W. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. Economic Class, by J. Fitzgerald, every Friday at 8.30 p.m. Non-members invited.

ISLINGTON—C. Thorp, Sec., 79, Grove Road, Holloway, N. Branch meets Tuesdays at 8.30 at the Co-op. Stores, 79, Grove Rd., Holloway.

PADDINGTON.—All communications to the Secretary at Ollins' Coffee Tavern, foot of Lock Bridge, Harrow Road, where Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m.

PECKHAM—W. Wren, Secretary, 91, Evelina Rd., Nunhead, S.E. Branch meets every Monday at 8.30 p.m., at 33, High St., Peckham, S.E.

ROMFORD DIVISION.—All communications to the Secretary, S.P.G.B. Club, 43, York Road, Ilford. Branch meets Fridays at 8 at Club. Club opens every evening. Debates alternate Tuesdays. All invited.

TOOTING—A. Barker, Secretary, 61, Glasford St., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8.30 p.m., at the address given.

TOTTENHAM.—Leslie Boyne, Secretary, 17, Ethelrey Road, South Tottenham, N. Branch meets every Wednesday at 8 o'clock at the Sunbeam Coffee Tavern, High Road.

WATFORD—T. Wilkins, Sec., 16, Merton Rd., Watford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Fridays in month at 8 p.m. Economic Class every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at the address given.

WEST HAM—G. C. H. Carter, Sec., 107, Ham Park Rd., Stratford. Branch meets Mondays 7.30, followed at 8.30 by discussion, at Spiritualist Hall, 32, Dames Road, Forest Gate.

WOOD GREEN.—J. Crump, Secretary, 10, Stanley Villas, Westbury Avenue, Wood Green, N. Branch meets every 1st and 3rd Thursday at 8.30 p.m.

LITERATURE AGENCY.

Comrades desiring to acquire or sell books on Social Science, etc. (new or second-hand), should send particulars to the Publications Department, S.P.G.B., 1A, Caledonian Road, King's Cross, London, N., from whom the undermentioned unsoiled works may be obtained at prices stated.

CAPITAL.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF CAPITALIST PRODUCTION.

By KARL MARX.

(Published at 1904.)

Carriage Free 5s. 6d.

SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND
WAGES.

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LABOUR

By PROF. J. E. THOROLD ROGERS.

(New Edition, Revised, Published at 1904.)

Carriage Free 5s. 6d.

POVERTY.

A STUDY OF TOWN LIFE.

By B. SEEBOM ROWNTREE.

(Illustrated by Folding Maps, Diagrams, &c.)
(Published at 1904.)

Carriage Free 4s. 6d.